THE TAMILIAN ANTIQUARY

Editor

PANDIT D. SAVARIROYAN

THE TAMILIAN ANTIQUARY

The Tamilian Antiquary.

VOL. I.

No. I.

i. **The Bharata Land or Dravidian India.**
By V. J. Tambi Pillai Esq., M.R.A.

ii. **The Solar and the Lunar Races of India.**
By V.J. Tambi Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

iii. **Ode to Cheraman-Udhiyan Cheralandan.**
By K.G. Sesha Iyer Esq., B.A., B.L.,

iv. **Notes: (1) The Relation of the Pandavas with the Tamilian Kings; and (2) the Etymology of the words Chera and Kerala.**
By Pandit D. Savariroyan. M.R.A.S.

No. 2.

A Critical Review of the Story of the Ramayana and An Account of South Indian Castes (in Tamil).
By V.P. Subramania Mudaliar Esq., G.B.V.C.

With an Introduction (in English).
By J.M. Nallaswami Pillai Esq., B.A., B.L.

No. 3.

Some Mile-stones in the History of Tamil Literature, or, The Age of Jnana Sambandha.
By the late Prof. P. Sundaram Pillai. M.A.

With an Introduction *By Rai Bahadur V. Venkayya Avi., M.A.*

No. 4

An Inquiry into the date of Manikkavacager :

i. **Manikkavacagar and His Date.**
By K.G. Sesha Iyer Esq., B.A., B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

(2) **Manikkavacagar and the Early Christians of Malabar.**
By Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

No. 5.

i. **Glimpses of Ancient Dravidians.**
By E.S.W. Senathi Raja Esq. LL.B., M.R.A.S.

ii. **The Augustan Age of Tamil Literature.**
By S. Krishnasawmi Aiyengar Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S.

iii. **The Ten Tamil Idyls,**
By the late Prof. P. Sundaram Pillai, M.A.

No. 6

Pura-porul (1) A summarised account of *Pura-Porul:* and (2) Selections translated from *Pura-nanuru.*

By the late Rev. G.U. Pope, M.A., D.D.

With an Introduction, *By J.M. Nallasurami Pillai Esq., B.A.,B.L.*

No. 7

Valmiki Ramayana and South Indian Sociology. (A collection of seven learned essays on the subject).

No. 8

i. **Dravidian Kingdoms.**

By Dewan Bahadur T. Desikachariar B.A., B.L.

ii. **The Conquest of Bengal and Burma by the Tamils.**

By the late Mr. V. Kanakasabhi Pillai B.A., B.L.

iii. **Distribution of Races Round the Persian Gulf.**

By J.A. Saldana Esq., B.A., LL.B

iv. **Representative Institutions in Southern India,**

By T. Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

v. **Laments.—Selections from Pura-Nanuru.**

By K.G. Sesha Aiyer Esq., B.A., B.L.

vi. **Serpent Workship in India.** *By M. Jivaratnam, Esq., B.A.*

vii. **The Ancient Dravidian Industries and Commerce.**

By the Pandit M. Raghava Aiyengar Avl.

No. 9

i. **Dravidian Kingdoms and List of Pandiyan Coins.**

By Dewan Bahadur T. Desikachariar. B.A., B.L.

ii. **Music in Ancient India.**

By C. Tirumalayya Naidu Esq, M.R.A.S.

iii. **The origin of the Cranganur (Kodungolur) Temple.**

By T. Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

iv. **The Age of Pattupattu.**

By T.A. Ramalingam Chettiar Esq., B.A., B.L.

v. **Heroic Mothers of Ancient Tamilagam. (In Tamil)**

By Pandit M. Raghava Iyengar Avl.

No. 10

i. **The origin of the Tamil Vellalas.**

By V.J. Tambv Pillai, Esq., M.R.A.S.

ii. **The Poets of the Tamil Lands.**

By the late Rev. G.U. Pope, MA., D.D.

The Tamilian Antiquary

VOL. II.

No. I.

I. An Old Tradition Preserved.
By V.J. Tamby Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

II. A Note on the Sangam Periods.
By The Editor.

III. The Antiquity of Nanjinad and Shenkottah.
By T. Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

IV. Sage Pavananhi, Critic and Teacher.
By M.S. Puranalingam Pillai Esq., B.A., L.T.

V. Dravidian Coins.
By Diwan Bahadur T.M. Rangachariar B.A. and
Diwan Bahadur T. Desikachariar, B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

VI. The Kural.
By The Rev. Dr. J. Lazarus.

VII. A Chapter from the Kural.
By J.M. Nallasamy Pillai Esq., B.A., B.L.

VIII. The Tamils in the Epic Age. (Tamil)
By Pandit M. Raghava Aiyanagar Avl.

IX. Lanka and the Tamil Sangam (Tamil)
By A. Muthuthamby Pillai Esq., Jaffna

X. Pandian Coins.
By Diwan Bahadur T. Desikachariar B.A., B.L. M.R.A.S.

No. 2

1. **The Cholas and their Coinage**
   By Diwan Bahadur T. Desikachari, B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

2. **The Origin of the Word 'ARYA'**
   By V.J. Tamby Pillai, Esq., M.R.A.S., (Ceylon)

3. **The Canarese War**
   By Ponnambalam Pillai, Exq., M.R.A.S.

4. **Tamil Proverbs**
   By The Rev. Dr. J. Lazarus

5. **St. Thomas, the Apostle, and India**
   By Joseph C. Panjikaran, Esq., M.A.

6. **Vibhishnan Buddhi**
   By M.S. Purnalingam Pillai Esq., B.A. LT.

ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE
C-2/15, Safardarjung Development Area
New Delhi-110 016

THE TAMILIAN ANTIQUARY

Editor
PANDIT D. SAVARIROYAN

VOL - I

NO - VII

ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
New Delhi, 1986

ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
C-2/15, SDA, P.B. No. 4534
New Delhi-110 016

Price : Rs. 720 (set)
Rs. 60 (No)
First Published : 1910
AES Reprint : 1986

Published by J. Jetley
For ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
C-2/15, SDA, NEW DELHI – 110016
Printed at Konark Press
Lakshmi Nagar, New Delhi – 110092

The Tamilian Antiquary.

No. 7.

VALMIKI RAMAYANA AND SOUTH INDIAN SOCIOLOGY.

I. A Critical Review of the Story of the Ramayana, and An Account of South Indian Castes. p. 1.
By V. P. Subramaniya Mudaliar Esq., G. B. V. C.

II. The Ramayana—An Historical Study. p. 17.
By P. V. Nanu Pillai Esq., B. A.

III. Studies in the Ramayana—The Geography and Ethnology of the Poem. p. 27.
By C. Tirumalayya Naidu Esq., M. R. A. S.

IV. The Morality of the Ramayana. p. 39.
By T. Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M. R. A. S.

V. The Morality of the Ramayana—A Review. p. 44.
By T. Sadasiva Aiyar Esq., B. A., M. L.

VI. The Morality of the Ramayana—A Rejoinder. p. 53.
By T. Ponnambalam Pillai Esq., M. R. A. S.

VII. Sri Valmiki and South India, (in Tamil.) p. 83.
By M. Raghava Aiyengar Esq., Editor, "Sen-Tamil.'

PUBLISHED BY THE HONY. SECRETARY

T. A. SOCIETY,

TRICHINOPOLY.

1910.

A Critical Review of

THE STORY OF

THE RAMAYANA

AND

AN ACCOUNT OF SOUTH INDIAN CASTES*

BY

MR. V. P. SUBRAMANIA MUDALIAR, G. B. V. C.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The late lamented Prof. P. Sundaram Pillai, M.A., Philosophy Professor, the Trivandram College, and the author of such rare works as 'மனோன்மணீயம்' and 'நூற்றொகை விளக்கம்' evinced much interest in historical researches. His "Milestones in the History of Tamil Literature" ‡ is a standing monument to his work in that field.

Certain truths brought to light in his researches, he did not live to publish. His unpublished convictions on various subjects of importance are likely to be met with in his diaries, in his letters, or are engraved in the memory of those who had the fortune to converse with him on such topics. One evening in Madras, a few years before his death, he held a *conversazione* at which I was present. The subject of the conversation turning upon the *Ramayana*, one of his friends asked him for his views on the same. The views he expressed then form the basis of the present paper on the Ramayana. I do not possess either his impressive method of

* This paper is a free translation of the "இராமாயண உள்ளுறை பொருள்" which appeared in No. 2, of the Tamilian Antiquary.

‡ Vide The Tamilian Antiquary, No. 3.

conveying conviction to his readers or the necessary historical training. It would have been much better if Mr. Sundaram Pillai had lived to publish his views on the subject. I expected that some of his friends better acquainted with him than myself would publish these views. As no such friend is forthcoming, I have to publish them for fear that they might otherwise be lost to the world. It is needless to add that any criticism of these views will have to be met by archaeologists who have made a study of the subject. Myself am an amateur and lay no claim to originality. The preface and the following pages are written as if they were Mr. Sundaram Pillai's.

PREFACE.

There are certain points which I should make clear to my readers before I publish my views on the Ramayana. I may without any vanity be allowed to say that I am behind few of my countrymen in point of religious fervour. Some of my views may seem irreligious at first sight. But a careful and scientific examination of the same will show that they are not actually so. I may however diverge from the popular and time-honoured, but in my opinion, misdirected beliefs regarding 'castes.' Caste system and religion are not necessarily connected with each other. So my ideas of 'caste' may differ from those of others, without in any way affecting the common religious sentiment. My views on the Ramayana have no concern with religion. But they are intimately connected with race distribution and 'caste' in the accepted sense of the word. To facilitate the enquiry, I propose to deal with the subject under three separate heads:—

i. Race distribution and 'Caste' or rather the non-existence of 'caste' at the time of the Ramayana.

ii. South Indian Castes prior to the time of the Ramayana.

iii. South Indian Castes after the time of the Ramayana.

SECTION I.

South Indian Castes

AT THE TIME OF

THE RAMAYANA

Of the two Ithihasas *Ramayana* and *Bhârata*, the latter is considered by some historians to have had some foundation on facts. But no historical incident has as yet been brought to light which could have supplied the groundwork for the construction of the story of the *Ramayana*.* 'Sita' and 'Rama' are used in the *Vedas* to mean 'furrow' and 'water' respectively. Linguists derive the words 'Aryar' and, 'ஏர்' from the same root and say that 'Aryar' means 'ஏருடையார்' (those owning ploughs—agriculturists). On these data some historians look upon the *Ramayana* as an allegorical representation of the spread of Aryan civilization in India and the conquest of South India by the Aryans. As such, the Ramayana of Valmiki would be a poem written by an Aryan poet to proclaim the prowess of the Aryans.

The merits of the Non-Aryans and the demerits of the Aryans as admitted by the Aryan poet need not be called in question. But where Valmiki mentions some prominent Dravidian princes † and enumerates the offences for which Rama fought against them, dethroned them and replaced them by men who would do his bidding, it would be worth while to enquire into the nature of the charges against the Dravidian

---

* Even granting that the 'Ramayana' was founded on facts the general line of argument followed in this paper will not be affected.

† The Dravidians in the poem are Vali, Sugriva, Hanuman and others of South India and Ravana, Vibheeshana, and others of Lanka. It does not stand to reason to suppose that these were monkeys and monsters as Valmiki would have us believe.

princes deposed by Rama and the methods he adopted to conquer them.

I. The two persons whom Valmiki accuses strongly are Ravana and Vali.

(*a*) The charges brought against Ravana are:—

i. that he incarcerated the Devas;

ii. that he disturbed the peace of the Aryan 'munivars' (ascetics); and

iii. that he abducted Sita.

(*b*) The charges levelled against Vali are:—

i. that he banished Sugriva; and

ii. that he took Sugriva's wife to himself.

II. The Aryan methods of conquest.
Will be discussed later on.

I. Valmiki's Culprits.

i. **Ravana.**—The high culture and the manifold achievements of Ravana are extolled by Valmiki himself. Ravana was an enlightened monarch, learned in the *Vedas*, versed in the science and art of music, and withal formidable in the battle-field. He had subjugated many lands by the strength of his arm. His subjects enjoyed peace and prosperity under his rule. His relatives received at his hands a cordial and hospitable treatment. It is not clear what Valmiki meant by describing him as a ten-headed monster with twenty hands. Perhaps the poet intended thereby to impress upon the minds of his readers the high order of intelligence and the extreme physical strength of Ravana. Otherwise the description is altogether meaningless.*

---

* Compare with the above, the remarks of Dr. G. Oppert in his "Original Inhabitants of India" (See p. p. 87 & 88). He writes. –

"While Ravana is regarded with horror by the Brahmans, *Râvanâbhêt*, a Vedic work on *Phonetics*, is ascribed to this Rakshasa. His memory is still cherished by the Jains. It is also curious that Ravana is esteemed and acknowledged by pious Pandits as a learned man, and is supposed to have been the author of a Telugu Grammar. Though the Rakshasas are

ii. **Vali.**—Vali was a South Indian prince of wide-spread renown. His very conquest of Ravana is enough to proclaim his valour. A devout worshipper of Civa, he could admire even in his foes such virtues as obedience to parents, love towards brothers, loyalty to one's wife, faithfulness to promise, courage in the battle-field, etc. Such virtues he admired even in Rama, the enemy of his country and his race.

So much in favour of Ravana and Vali. Let us now examine what Valmiki has to say against them.

(*a*) **The charges against Ravana**

i. The incarceration of the Devas :—

The Devas were a section of the Aryan race. The Aryans gave the Dravidians the appellation of monkeys and monsters, and styled themselves Suras (சுரர்) and Devas (தேவர்), "gods." The Devas were thus a part of the Aryan race. If Ravana took captive a section of his foes, it is, to say the least, no detriment to his character.

ii. Disturbing the peace of the 'munivars':—

The 'munivars' in question were Aryan ascetics who settled themselves in the Dravidian forests and acted as spies upon the Dravidians. The Dravidians tore off their mask of religion and banished them from their lands without meting out the extreme but justifiable punishment of death. Herein the generosity of the Dravidian nature is apparent.

iii. The abduction of Sita:—

When there is enmity or when war breaks out between two nations, it is customary for the one to sieze by force or

---

described in the Ramayana and else-where as horrible both physically and morally, it appears that the condition of being a Rakshasa depended more upon the sins committed by an individual or by his progenitors than upon the accident of birth. If this be admitted, the physical monstrosities ascribed to the Rakshasas must be regarded as the exaggerated creations of a morbid and hostile imagination. Even the Ramayana extols the beauty and grandeur of Lanka, its architectural splendour, and the efficiency of its administration. This latter was so excellent, that no thief dared to pick up any valuable thing lost on its streets. The enemies of Rama could hardly, therefore, have been so rude and uncivilised as they are generally represented." [Ed.]

stratagem the men, women, cattle, etc., belonging to the other. Now the Aryans were making their aggressive march upon the Dravidian kingdoms. And Ravana acted within his rights in imprisoning Sita. When Sita was in Lanka, she was treated with becoming princely dignity. She was placed in *Asokavana*, one of Ravana's best parks, with Ravana's own niece for her companion and several other maids for her attendants. Falling in love with her, Ravana pressed his suit for her hand, but he was never rude or ungentlemanly in his behaviour towards her. He would not, like a barbarian, force her into marriage with him. This is not all. Even when countless myriads of his army had lost their lives in the battle-field, even when his brother Kumbakarna and his son Indrajit had died in the fight, he would not in his blind rage destroy the life of his enemy's wife. It was not that the thought did not strike him. He thought of it and just to frighten Rama and Lakshmana he caused a lifelike effigy of Sita to be destroyed before their eyes.

This is the treatment that the Aryan Sita received at the hands of the Dravidian Ravana. But how did the Dravidian Surpanaka fare at the hands of the Aryan Lakshmana? The spirit of chivalry shone in Lakshmana when he mutilated the nose and ears of Surpanaka. And to justify the abominable action, Valmiki gravely states that the woman tried to kidnap Sita in the presence of a man—Lakshmana. Even granting that she did try to do so, could not the victor of Indrajit* find less clumsy and more honourable methods of defeating her purpose? Did Rama at least feel sorry for the atrocity his brother had perpetrated? No. How could we expect a personage, who actually killed Thataka, feel compunction for the mere mutilation of the limbs of another woman.

The abduction of Sita might have even been an act of vengeance on the part of Ravana for the injustice perpetrated

---

* Indrajit, son of Ravana. 'Indrajit' literally means 'the victor of Indra'

on his relative Thataka and his sister Surpanaka. If so, Ravana's action requires not even the shadow of a justification. The behaviour of Ravana towards Sita and the behaviour of Rama and Lakshmana towards Thataka and Surpanaka give one an insight into the treatment accorded to women by the Dravidians and Aryans respectively. The Dravidian and Aryan civilizations need not be compared further. And we need not wonder why the Dravidians considered the Aryans 'mlechas' or barbarians.*

The description of Ravana's city, with its streets, palaces and parks, the educational attainments of men like Ravana and Hanuman, the reception accorded by Ravana to ambassadors like Hanuman and Angathan, the royal style of life allowed to Sita during the period of her imprisonment—all these go to indicate the state of Dravidian civilization as it then was.

(*b*) **The sins of Vali.**

Vali is accused of banishing his brother Sugriva and robbing him of his wife. Vali was by right of primogeniture the ruler of Kishkindha. He was for some time away in foreign lands, Sugriva meanwhile acting as his representative in the kingdom. When Vali returned from his travels, Sugriva refused to hand over the reins of government and Vali had to fight for his crown. Eventually, Sugriva, Hanuman and other traitors were driven into exile. But their wives were allowed to remain in the land without molestation. These might have been the bare facts. There is reason to believe that Valmiki has distorted the facts favourably to Rama and Sugriva. If Sugriva did not seek his brother's life out of ambition for the crown, he would have, on Vali's death, enthroned Angathan, Vali's son, and the rightful heir to the throne. That Sugriva did not do so indicates clearly that he acted the regicide as well as the fratricide. A justification was needed for the conduct of Sugriva and Rama towards Vali. And it is probable that to supply the justification Valmiki invented the tale of Vali's coveting his brother's wife.

* Vide the Tamil lexicon, 'Nigandu' (நிகண்டு) of Mandala Purudar.

II. The Aryan Methods of Conquest:

i. The last words of Vali evince the high admiration he had for Rama. Vali was, besides, a valiant soldier. Under such circumstances one might reasonably ask why Rama preferred Sugriva's to Vali's friendship. As has already been hinted, Vali was strong enough to stand on his own legs. If Rama had befriended him, Vali would have reciprocated the sentiment. But certainly he would not have helped Rama, a foreigner and a new friend, against Ravana, an old friend and a Dravidian ruler like himself. With Sugriva it was otherwise. He was a banished prince and in need of help. It was likely that he would be grateful for any help offered at that juncture. Sugriva was moreover a man who had proved traitorous to his own brother. Such a man was not likely to shrink from taking the field against a Dravidian prince—Ravana—in favour of a foreign intruder—Rama. These were probably the motives that actuated Rama in befriending Sugriva and his followers and teaching them the Aryan military tatics.

Rama did not however side with Sugriva openly and run the risk of losing Vali's good-will. In case Sugriva should lose in the fratricidal war, Rama had yet the chance of trying to persuade Vali to join him against Ravana.

ii. We have seen how Rama made use of Sugriva for conquering Kishkindha. A similar stratagem was used in the case of Lanka also. Ravana's brother, Vibheeshana, was a willing tool in the hands of Rama. The Aryan writer Valmiki has endowed this Vibheeshana with many virtues in consideration of the latter's help to the Aryans against the best interests of his country and his race. The Dravidians of a later date have been foolish enough to follow Valmiki and dub Vibheeshana with the honorific title of *Azhwar* (ஆழ்வார்.) Like Sugriva, Vibheeshana was a traitor and a fratricide in one. The only difference between these two persons lies in this that the latter possessed more cunning

and less courage. The one tried to gain in open fight what his brother had obtained by right of primogeniture. The other tried to gain by low cunning and treachery the kingdom owned by his brother by right of conquest. Justly or unjustly, the one had been driven into exile by his brother; the other was kept in royal state by the bounty of his brother. Not satisfied with this, Vibheeshana aspired to become king and he sought the friendship of Rama.

Valmiki contends that the unrighteous conduct of Ravana with reference to Sita was the root cause of the apostacy of Vibheeshana. It has already been noticed that the imprisonment of Sita casts no slur on Ravana's character. Even granting that the action was improper, that would be a reason for Vibheeshana's severing his connection with Ravana, and not for his acting the traitor to his country and his race. Like Vibheeshana, Kumbakarna and Indrajit pleaded the cause of Sita; but they did not like him leave Ravana in the lurch at the critical moment. They were quite prepared to fight to the death in the interests of their country and their sovereign. Kumbakarna's patriotism could not be shaken even by Vibheeshana's tempting and perhaps genuine offer of the throne of Lanka in the event of Ravana's demise in the battle-field. Vibheeshana's conduct is inexplicable on the ground that every patriot's duty is to rescue his country from the hand of oppression. Ravana might have caused trouble to the Devas and other Aryan sections, but mention is nowhere made in Valmiki of his having oppressed his subjects. What then induced Vibheeshana to debase himself at the feet of Rama and instruct him as to the vulnerable points of the Dravidian heroes? What, if not his ambition for the crown which manifested itself on Ravana's death.

The then Social Condition of India.

At the time of the Ramayana, the Aryans, it would seem, were just colonising South India. They had not yet

entered into large cities. They built huts in the forests and lived in them. Caste differentiation does not seem to have existed either in South or in North India. We learn from the Ramayana that Rama with great respect and cordiality *shook hands* with Guha, a chief of the Nishadas, at the shores of the Ganges. It never entered his thoughts that his person might be polluted by the touch of a non-Aryan Nishada. We find again the royal guests in the house of the *Vanara* prince, in the Malaya hills of the South, freely moving, dining and sleeping in the midst of the courtiers of Sugriva, and fostering a brotherly feeling towards, and intimate union with, the latter prince. In their return journey to Ayodhya, we find Sita in the friendly company of *Vanara* ladies of high rank. We also find the royal members of Ayodhya accompanied by the brave Dravidian warriors to whose valour the victory was mainly due, entering the hermitage of the renowned Brahman Bharadvaja where a rich feast is provided for them. The Rakshasas, Vanaras, Brahmans and the royal household of Ayodhya sit together at table and partake freely of the good things placed before them. Nowhere do we find the slightest trace of that hated caste distinction—the curse of later-day India. The picture here given is that of the Social condition of the people of India three thousand years ago. If, then, the Aryan poet called other races 'Monkeys,' and 'Monsters' it indicates nothing else than the existence in him of a feeling of race hatred and contempt for neighbours.

Assuming the historicity of the Ramayana, the geographical distribution of South India would be about the following. The country between the Vindhyas and the Nizam's dominions was known the eastern portion as Dandakaranya and the western as Janasthana. It was ruled by Sûrpanakhâ acting as the representative of Ravana. To the south of Janasthana and Dandakaranya, round Mysore, ruled the Dravidian kings Neelan, Vali, etc. The *Tamilagam*, "the home of the Tamils," which lay to the south of Mysore, must have been a fertile country then. Special mention is made in Valmiki of Pandia's wealth.

The Ramayana – An Historical Study.*

BY

MR. P. V. NANU PILLAI, B.A.

Of all the great literary productions of ancient India none is more widely popular or is more generally appreciated by Hindus of all classes and of different degrees of intelligence than the Ramayana of Valmiki. There are greater and even sublimer works, such as the Vedas and the Upanishads. But none of them except the Mahabharatha can be said to be so well-known to and appreciated by the people at large. Even the Mahabharatha is not so much an epic poem, as it is an encyclopœdia of ancient Hindu legends and folklore, collected and collated by successive authors known by the general designation of Vyasa. Further it is an unwieldy work, perhaps the longest poetical work in the World. The Ramayana, on the other hand, is the work of a single author, Valmiki, justly known as the *Adikavi* or the first poet. He is not merely first in the order of time, but first also in the order of merit. Of all the epic poems in the world, the Ramayana stands unparalleled. Its peculiar fascination lies in the compactness of the story, in the chasteness and the simplicity of its language, in the loftiness of its ethics and above all in the religious instruction which it imparts to its votaries. The word *Rama* is a household name in every Hindu family. It has such significance to the Hindu mind that it is almost synonymous with the name of God—so much so that the very uttering of the word, a number of times, constitutes a round of prayer in the case of an ordinary Hindu. The word Rama is derived from the word *ram* which means to *please*, and it is used in the sense of *Atmaram, i.e.*, that which pleases the soul.

* The Editor desires it to be understood that, in printing this paper in the Tamilian Antiquary, he does not accept any responsiblity for the views expressed by the writer. The paper is reprinted by kind permission from the "Malabar Quarterly Review" only as showing the different aspects of this much-discussed question.

It is therefore no wonder, that the epic poem which celebrates the deeds of Rama has so much charm to the Hindu mind. It is to the Hindus what the *Bible* is to the Christians, the *Koran* to the Mohammadans, the *Avesta* to the Parsis and the *Bodhisathwa* to the Buddhists. The story of the *Ramayana* is a simple one and a brief summary of it, in as few words as possible, will be a fitting introduction to the subject of this paper, as in the course of our discussion, frequent allusion has to be made to it.

Dasaratha, king of Ayodhya, is afflicted with the sad thought that he has no son and the reflection *Aputrasya-gatir-nasti*, "the sonless have no salvation" makes him quite miserable. With a view to beget a son to whom to bequeathe the kingdom which has had an uninterrupted line of succession, he performs a great yagam to propitiate the gods. Pleased with its austerity, they bless him with four sons. The eldest of these, born of Kausalya one of the three consorts of the king, was called Rama. The next one Bharatha, was born of Kaikeyi. Sumithra gave birth to the twins Lakshmana and Sathrughna. When Rama came of age, King Dasaratha made preparations to install him on his throne and seek rest in forest which his growing years and the custom of his country rendered necessary. Jealous of the preference shown by the Raja to the son of Kausalya, Kaikeyi demands of the King the fulfilment of a promise made by him in former days that her wishes would be gratified whatever they might be and whenever they were pressed forward. The King to whom truth is the highest law of being and justice is an application of it to human affairs, complies at once with Kaikeyi's request, to banish Rama to the forest and to install his son Bharatha instead. Thus Rama goes into the woods followed by his beloved wife Sita and his faithful brother Lakshmana. They wander in the forest from hermitage to hermitage for about ten years when they settled down near Nasik. At this time Ravana, King of Rakshasas, visits

the hermitage of Rama during his absence and stealthily takes Sita into his aerial car and carries her away to Lanka The brothers then set out from there in quest of Sita, form an alliance with Sugriva, the King of the Monkeys, get across to the island of Ceylon, engage Ravana in battle, vanquish him outright, recover Sita and return to Ayodhya where Sri-Rama was crowned as King.

The Ramayana like many other Indian epics is a story founded on solid facts of history. It is a history of the Aryan colonisation of South India. If by history is meant a correct record of the doings of the people at any period of their life, their habits, manners and customs, their mode of living, their way of fighting, the causes of their wars, the weapons they used in battles, the religions they professed, the ethics they followed and the gods they worshipped, we have in the Ramayana, copious materials which will afford a faithful history of the Indian people at a period long anterior to the Christian era.

The poem begins with the description of Ayodhya and an eulogium on Dasaratha and his ministers. The city of Ayodhya is described as being situate on the banks of the river Sarayu, studded with forts and fortresses, with towers and palaces. The city is peopled by the different orders of society, the Brahmans, the Kshathrias, the Vaisyas and the Sudras. The Brahmans were treated with the highest respect. The Kshathriyas occupied a position next in rank to the Brahmans. The Vaisyas formed a common folk. The Sudras were serfs in the employ of the other three classes. They were the descendants of the conquered aborginal races not much advanced in civilisation and were naturally treated therefore as servants. Dasaratha had eight ministers of the cabinet, all of them being Brahmans. Vasishta and Vamadeva were the foremost of them. Of the eight members, *Purohita* was the chief family priest and religious adviser to the king answering to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Next

comes the *Prathinidhi*, the Ambassador; next in order is the *Pradana* or the Prime minister. The next is *Suchina* or the War minister. Then comes *Manthri* or the Chief Counsellor. *Praswivaka* or the Chief Judge of the Privy Council; *Pandita* the expert in Sruthis and Smrithis and *Sumantharaka* or the Private Secretary to the King, make up the cabinet of those days in strict conformity with the ordinance of Manu. The poet next describes the grief of Dasaratha on account of his being heirless. The next chapters deal with the birth of the children and their early training. They studied the Vedas and the Sastras before the age of sixteen. Intellectually and morally therefore they had no superiors. In physical pursuits also they were trained from their infancy. They were the sons of a king and as such they were trained in the use of swords and arrows and in all other manly exercises. In fact they did not neglect one branch of education to the detriment of the other. They bestowed the greatest attention upon the training of the body which we in these days of degeneration do not care for. They realised the principle that without a healthy body, healthy morality and healthy intellect were impossible. From these facts you will see how fallen the modern Hindus are in their notion of education.

The poet next goes on to describe the Swayamvaram of Sita, and the intrigues at the Court of Ayodhya by reason of which Rama is banished into the Dekhan which is described as a huge forest inhabited by races unfriendly to the Aryas.

Coming to the South of India, the poet brings us face to face with no less than half a dozen different varieties of humanity. First, we are introduced to Guha, who is described as the head of a nomadic race of people who lived upon the roots and fruits of the forests and upon the flesh of wild animals which they hunted. They had no houses but dwelt under the shades of trees or in temporary huts thatched with leaves. They were not unfriendly to the Aryans, but

acknowledged their superiority. The depth of contempt in which these people were held by the Aryans may be seen from the fact that Bharata becomes astonished to hear that Sri-Rama *shook hands with* Guha. That Sri-Rama should pollute his person by the touch of an unclean Kiratha was really a matter of wonder and surprise to his brother Bharata. Going still more south into the Dekhan the poet brings to our view, the cannibal Viradha whom Rama kills. The poet gives us only one or two instances of cannibals whom Sri-Rama is said to have slain. The fact is that when the Aryan colonization of South India began, they found some places inhabited by cannibals whom they at once destroyed. Next we are introduced to the great Rakshasas and the Monkey races.

As I have already said, the story of the Ramayana is a history of the Aryan colonization of South India. Sri-Rama, though he is a single individual should not be treated as such. He is simply the representative of the Aryan people who have colonised the countries of South India as far as Nasik. To the south of Nasik lay the great Rakshasa kingdom and a little to the east was the Kingdom of the Monkeys. These Monkeys and Rakshasas should not be looked upon as quadrumana or demons. They represented the two prominent races of South India at the time of the Ramayana. The Rakshasas as their name indicates were a fierce race of people who scorned the supremacy of the Aryans and had withstood all their attempts to aryanize them through long ages. They occupied the countries to the south of Nasik on the west coast of India. This country extended up to Cape Comorin and thence to Ceylon. They were a considerably civilised people. They were armed with swords and spears. The science of archery was also known to them. But they excelled in the use of swords. They were perhaps acquainted with the sea and knew the art of navigation. Their Chief is said to have had an aerial car. They had a feudal system among themselves consisting of petty lords or generals who

followed their king whenever called upon to do so. They were not illiterate. Their Chief, Ravana, is said to have been conversant with the Vedas and the Sastras. He had a fortress in his city of Lanka which is described as impregnable. He had two brothers whom he treated as his colleagues. He had his uncles also of whom we hear only in the first part of the story. They seem to have governed the country of Hindustan near Nasik; for they were the first to take the field against Rama to chastise him for the mutilation of Sûrpanakhâ. Ravana had two or three sons of whom Indrajit is the foremost. He is the eldest but in no place is he treated as the heir-apparent. He is treated rather as a favoured general. Ravana had a sister to whom is ascribed the cause of the war. She had a husband first who died; and she seems to have had children by him. But she was young and wanted to re-marry. The Rakshasa women were free to choose their husbands. As she was wandering in the outskirts of the empire she met with two handsome youths from the north; and naturally she felt an inclination towards them. But they mutilated her.

Coming next to the Monkey race as they were called, we find them to be a partially civilized people having their king, their government, their ministers and officers. They had a fort in which were the houses of their chiefs and their dependants. Their king Bâli is described as a powerful chief, who was feared by all. He is also a religious man and used to say his morning and evening prayers regularly. This king had an army which was large, but they had no weapons except clubs and sticks. They were a strong and well-built people. They had a settled system of inheritance. But they were mostly black and were, probably on that account, called Monkeys by the Aryans. They seem to have been the descendants of an Assyrian race of people who entered India at a very remote time. They were the worshippers of Surya or the Sun. Their king Bâli worshipped this deity in the morning and evening. Their other chief Sugriva

is called the son of Surya and Hanuman their minister is said to have been a pupil of the same deity. These facts go to prove that they were an Assyrian colony that settled in India from time immemorial. They were a peace-loving race and were mostly vegetarians living upon fruits and roots. They had heard of the powers of the Aryanized Kshatrias and had taken to learning their language. Hanuman is described as speaking the Sanskrit language with a fluency and accent that astonished the brothers Rama and Lakshmana. They were therefore easily brought under the Aryan influence and turned out to be a great source of strength to the Aryans in the war that followed.

Now that I have given a description of the Rakshasas and the Monkeys and have made the reader understand that they were men like ourselves, let me resume the thread of my narrative. The Aryans, I have told had colonized all countries to the north of Nasik; and to the south of Nasik lay the kingdom of the Rakshasas. These Aryans were an agricultural people, and wherever they went they reclaimed forests and tilled the soil. They lived upon the milk of their cattle and the produce of their soil; occasionally they used to hunt and eat of the venison. Their chief was called Rama or Sri-Rama which name is perhaps identical with the Hali-Rama of the Mahabharata. Hali-Rama means the Rama with the plough and as such is a typical Aryan farmer. His wife was called Sita which again means a furrow and is again symbolical of Aryan agriculture. In the borders of their colony they frequently came in contact with the Rakshasas and had on one occasion maltreated their women having cut off their noses and ears. Ravana, the king of Rakshasas, was duly informed of this outrage and he soon came to chastize the enemy. He planned a novel mode of campaign. He knew the Aryans to be good archers and perhaps knew his own weakness also. He therefore called in the aid of Maricha who is described as assuming the form of a golden deer and enticing away the brothers, Rama and

Lakshmana. This golden deer is again symbolical of wild cattle. Maricha collected a herd of wild cattle and let them loose on the crops of the Aryans.

Seeing that their crop was in danger of being destroyed all the male members went to the rescue of the same. In the meanwhile, Ravana and his followers entered their houses and carried away their implements of agriculture and all their women. When the male members returned home they found their homes plundered and deserted. They at once set out in search of their women and property. They first met with Jadayu who is described as a bird, but who in reality was the typical pariah slave of the period. He was not given entrance into the houses of the Aryans, but was allowed to live at a respectable distance from the residence of his lords. He lived upon the carcasses of men and animals. But with all that he was a faithful servant; and as such he did his best to save the women and property of his master. But he was no match to Ravana who at once cut him down with his sword. He just lived long enough to tell the story of the kidnapping of Sita.

Then the poet describes the search of Sita by Rama and Lakshmana. After many adventures, they meet with Hanuman, the minister of Sugriva. Sugriva was driven away from his kingdom by his brother Bâli and was living as an exile in the forest. So there was much of mutual sympathy between Rama and Sugriva. They enter into alliance as a sequel to which Bâli is killed in battle by Rama and the kingdom of Kishkindha is given over to Sugriva. Rama and Sugriva then find out the whereabouts of Sita and attempt to cross the Ocean. At this time Vibhishana, the traitor-brother of Ravana privately sees Rama and enters into a secret alliance with him.

With the powerful assistance of Sugriva and with the no less powerful support of Vibhishana, Rama crosses over to Ceylon, engages Ravana in battle, kills him and all his men

and installs Vibhishana as King of the Rakshasas. Vibhishana in gratitude for his leige-lord takes Sita back and places her at his feet. After this Rama returns home and reigns as sovereign. Here ends practically the story of the Ramayana. From the account just now given you will find that by this war, the whole of South India including Ceylon was subdued by the Aryans and that these countries were in due course completely Aryanized.

I have now told you that the History of the Ramayana was the history of a war between the aryanized Kshatriyas of the North and the non-aryanized Rakshasas of the South. In this war the Rakshasa power was completely subdued, their kingdom being made tributary to the Empire of Ayodhya. The downfall of the Rakshasas was due partly to intrigues among themselves and partly to the powerful support the Aryans derived from the Assyrian inhabitants of India but mostly to the mental and moral superiority of the Aryans.

Now the question may naturally arise as to who these Rakshasas were. Were they Kshatrias? Or, as such were they a branch of the Aryan people? Did they belong to the Monkey race? Were they a separate race of people differing from all these? Are they in these days represented by any peoples of India?

For this purpose we have to draw a comparison between the races already treated of. First let us proceed with the question whether the Rakshasas were Monkeys and try to answer it.

1. The Monkeys are described as vegetarians, which the Rakshasas were not.

2. The Monkeys though they were a strong and well-built people were not as fierce and war-like as the Rakshasas.

3. The Monkeys were a peace-loving people. But the Rakshasas if they loved anything at all, loved war.

4. Hanuman and Sugriva are described as men almost resembling Monkeys. But Ravana is described as *Daçahasya* that is a double *Panchahasya*, which means broad-faced.

5. Bali and Sugriva worshipped the sun. But Ravana and his people worshipped Civa.

6. The Monkeys were not much learned as the Rakshasas. Ravana is said to be conversant with the Vedas and the Sastras.

7. The Monkeys had no weapons except clubs and stones. But the Rakshasas were skilled in the use of swords and spears. They knew also the art of archery.

8. The Monkeys lived in an inland country and were afraid of the ocean when they first saw it. The Rakshasas lived, some of them at least, beyond the ocean and knew the art of navigation.

9. The Rakshasas in spite of their being fierce were a more civilized people than the Monkeys.

10. The Monkeys had a system of inheritance which was from father to son. But the Rakshasas had no settled system. Ravana gets his kingdom not from his father who was a Brahman sage; but he inherits his kingdom through his mother's ancestors. Again Ravana's kingdom goes to his brother and not to his son.

11. Lastly nowhere is it said in the Ramayana that these two peoples were inter-related. In fact the Rakshasas despised the Monkeys as did the Kshatriyas also.

Now let us see whether these Rakshasas were Kshatriyas and as such Aryans.

1. They were like the Kshatriyas a warlike people.

2. Their women like the Kshatriyas were free to choose their husbands.

3. They like the Kshatriyas worshippped Civa. Almost all the Civa temples in Northern India are ascribed to the

Prathishta of Janaka and other Kshatriya kings. The Civa temples in South India are ascribed to the Prathishta of Kara and other Rakshasas.

4. It was the custom among the ancient Kshatriyas when any family was going to become extinct, to beget children in Kshatriya women by Brahmans. This practice was followed in the case of Ravana.

5. Among the ancient Kshatriyas Polyandry and Polygamy prevailed as may be seen from the stories in the Mahabharata. The Rakshasas were also subject to this custom.

6. The Rakshasas used to do penance as did the Kshatriya kings. But when a Sudra did it, he was punished with death by Sri-Rama.

7. Again the Kshatriyas of the Mahabharata are described as having Asura blood in them. Whence did they get this Asura blood if they did not belong primarily to the Asura stock?

In all these respects the Kshatriyas and the Rakshasas agree. Let us now see wherein they differ.

1. The Kshatriyas professed caste and acknowledged the social superiority of the Brahmans which the Rakshasas did not.

2. The Kshatriyas had a fixed system of inheritance which, we have shewn, the Rakshsas had not.

3. The Kshatriyas performed yagas or Brahman rites which the Rakshasas made it a rule to obstruct.

4. The Rakshasas though they were once polyandrous and polygamous had become entirely mono-androus and monogamous at the time of the Ramayana.

These are the points of difference. But the points of agreement are more numerous and important than the points of difference which may be explained away by saying that

Kshatrias had completely aryanized themselves under the moral influence of the Brahmans.

Now a theory may be formulated which I hope will explain the complete aryanisation of the Kshatrias.

The Aryan Brahmans entered India not as conquerors but as spiritual teachers. For they, even to this day, trace their descent from some spiritual Guru or Rishi. These Gurus were headed by a religious chief called Manu; and there were a number of successive Manus whose duty it was to make laws and regulations for the conduct and guidance of their followers from time to time. These laws and regulations are what are known as the Manava Dharma Sastras. The mission of the Aryans was thus at first a peaceful one. But in course of time they were forced to take up arms, just as the English merchants later on were forced to do so for their defence. These Aryans were mentally and morally the superiors of the peoples that inhabited India at that time. These latter belonged either to an earlier wave of the Aryan exodus to the south or to the kindred family of the Semitics or were probably a mixed race composed of both. But all accounts go to shew that they were a people closely allied to the Aryans. They were the worshippers of Civa and the idols and were probably divided into three orders of society but not into castes, the then orders being the king and their followers, the landlords and merchants and the serfs or servants.

It was at this juncture that the Aryas entered India just as it was when the Hindus were divided into four castes that the Mahomedans invaded the country. The Puranas and Itihasas describe the struggle that was going on for long ages between these Aryas and the non-Aryanized peoples of India.

Many of these latter were in due course completely aryanised and were called Manavas or the followers of Manu. The term Manava was at first a term of contempt

applied by the natives of India to denote a follower of Manu just as the term Christian was a term of contempt applied originally by the Ancient Jews to denote a follower of Christ.

The Manavas were divided into four castes as the Brahmans, Kshatrias, Vysyas and Sudras of whom the Brahmans or Bhusuras were the descendants of those Rishis, who entered India for proselytizing, while the remaining castes were taken from society as it was then existing in India. But apart from these four castes, there remained a fifth class of people made up entirely of the natives of India who preferred to worship their own gods rather than submit to the gods of the Aryans. These people fled to the South of India and were called by the Aryas as Asuras and Rakshasas which terms originally meant only the ungodly or the infidel as opposed to the Aryas who were called the Suras, the godly or faithful people by pre-eminence.

With the advance of the Aryans and the aryanized natives southwards the Asuras also receded until at last all the plains of India and even Ceylon came into the Aryan possession. These Asuras and Rakshasas are then described as taking shelter in a place called Pâthâlam. It is from the confines of this Pathala that Malayavan the father of Kykesi is described as going out in search of a kinsman to marry his daughter. But finding none, he marries her to the Rishi Visravas by whom she gets three sons Ravana, Kumbhakarna and Vibhishna. When these princes grew up they regained their lost possession of Lanka and re-asserted their former predominance. It was to destroy this predominance that the Ramayana war was undertaken and the precautions taken by the Aryans to completely overthrow the rising Rakshasa power correspond exactly with the precautions taken by the English in order to subdue the rising Mahomedan power of Tippu.

Now one word about Pâthâla and I have done with this historical aspect. Where was this Pathala? Was it an

under-ground world or was it any country in India itself? I say it is no under-ground world. It was some place in South India itself where the non-Aryanized population of India took final shelter. Let us then see what part of South India corresponds, exactly with the description of the Pathala mentioned in the Puranas.

I think that the country bounded on the east by the Western Ghats, on the north by the mountains near Nasik and on the west and south by the sea was probably the Pathala of the Puranas. The synonyms for Pathala are *Adhobhuvana* 'an under-ground world;' *Balisatma*, 'the country of Mahabali,' the Asura chief; *Nagaloka* 'the country of the serpents;' and *Kuhara* 'a cave.'

This country on the Malabar Coast which I have mentioned is the only place even now for a pursued army to take final shelter in South India. It was not known to the Aryans until a very late period. The Ramayana professes to be entirely ignorant of the countries South of Nasik. This country is called even to this day as Papa-Bhumi, 'the country of the *Papis* or Barbarians', by the Hindus. It is an under-ground world when looked down from the Western Ghats. It is again at the foot of the world when viewed from the hills. It is this country in which even to this day the memory of an Asura chief is cherished with joy and enthusiasm. *Onam* and other festive days are all in commemoration of the ideal Asura king Mahabali. In no other part of India we will find the memory of an Asura chief so much cherished. Again the Malabar Coast is the abode of serpents by pre-eminence. It is noted for the number and variety of its serpents. In no part of the world will you find serpents being worshipped as in Malabar. No other country of the world can boast of special serpent priests called *Pullavars* even to this day. These *Pullavars* are perhaps the descendants of a serpent worshipping people who were subdued by the Asuras. The

present Nairs are probably the descendants of those Asura warriors who defied the power of the Aryans in the plains and who, when they found that resistance was hopeless to defend the plains, sent first their women and children into the country beyond the Ghats and stationed powerful military guards in all the passes that opened the country to the outer-world. The present Sasta temples stationed at the entrance to these passes were temples of Civa, originally established by the Asura armies for their worship. Even the "Keralolpathi" acknowledges that these Sasta temples were instituted for the purpose of preventing the influx of the Aryan Brahmans from the plains. All these facts more than bear out the truth of my statement that the country described as Pathala in the Puranas is the country of the Malabar Coast.

The long absence of the male members from home for defending their country and upholding their tradition led in due course to a system of matriarchal government of properties among these warlike Asuras which had developed into the *Marumakkathayam* law after the entire annihilation of the Asura forces in the battle of Lanka.

Now I have explained to you the common origin of the Rakshasas and the Kashatrias. It is my duty to prove that the commonly accepted theory that the Kshatrias were Aryans, who entered India along with the Brahmans, is a mistake. The surest test of kinship is inter-marriage. The very fact that there were from the beginning no inter-marriages between the Brahmans and the Kshatrias proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that they belonged either to two distinct races or at least to two different branches of the same race. If inter-marriage was current before the time of Manu, none of the Manus or no amount of legislation could have been able to check it. In fact legislation prohibiting inter-marriage would have been simply impossible. Again, the Vedic Brahmans never worshipped

Civa. The name of Civa is not even mentioned in the oldest parts of the Vedas. The contempt in which this deity was held by the Brahmans may be seen from the fact that they even to this day do not partake of the food placed at the altar of Civa. The reason alleged for this attitude of the Brahmans is that Civa was a Brahman-killer. What does this mean? If it means anything at all, it is that Civa was a God of another religion entirely opposed to and subversive of Brahmanism.

To show the moral purpose of the Ramayana I need only point out to you the various aspects in which the several characters in it are delineated. The person of Sri-Rama is always held out as the highest type of man. Whether as a son or pupil, or as a brother or friend, or as husband or father, or as an ally or enemy, or as a king or sage in whatever aspects he is viewed the figure of Sri-Rama stands out pre-eminently as among the highest ideals of humanity. Coming to the character of Sita, she is held out as the highest ideal of womanhood. In spite of being placed in adverse circumstances, in spite of being exposed to imminent dangers, and at the sight of death, she preserves her equanimity of temper and is never swayed by any other consideration than firm devotion to her lord. As to the character of Bharata, Lakshmana and Satrughna each of them excels the other in their devotion to their brother. I shall close this aspect of the Ramayana with a quotation. When Bharata finds out in the forests Sri-Rama and compels him to return home these are the words that formed his answer :—"There is nothing greater than truth and truth should be esteemed the most esteemed of all things. The Vedas have their sole foundation on truth. Having promised obedience to my father's commands I will never through covetousness or forgetfulness or blind ignorance break down the barrier of truth."

STUDIES
IN THE RAMAYANA.

BY

Mr. C. TIRUMALAYYA NAIDU, M. R. A. S.

THE GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY OF THE POEM.

A knowledge of geography and an ethnological survey of the country comprised in the Ramayana will be found to be necessary for an elucidation of many an intricate situation occuring in the poem. In the words of Mr. Cust, 'the glimpses of geographical knowledge afore-said of the poet are highly interesting to trace out; and the insight gained into the habits and manners of the people at the time the poem was written is invaluable.' The geography of the poem may not always be credible: but it is interesting as showing the extent and accuracy of the knowledge possessed by the poet. It is curious to find that, though the whole continent of what is now known as India was roughly known to the poet, he nowhere refers to it as a single whole, nor does he give any separate name for it. The name India is said to be derived from the Greek and the Roman adaptation of the word Hindu, which was used by the Persians for their Aryan brethren, because the latter settled in the districts surrounding the streams of the Sindh (pronounced by them Hindu and now called Indus). The words *Bharatavarsha* and *Aryavarta* do not occur in the poem. The latter was the name given by Manu to the region between the Himalayas and the Vindhya mountains. *Bharata* was the most famous ruler of the Lunar dynasty and reigned at Hastinapura, the modern Delhi, over a more or less large part of India, which was henceforth known after his name.

The poem opens with a description of the Kosala country on the bank of the Sarayu, the modern Gogra, which is supposed to have had its origin in the lake Manasaras, in the Himalayas. Although Ayodhya, its capital, whose extent was twelve yojanas in length and three in breadth (a yojana varying from four to eight miles) was 'the base of operations in the story, still the poet takes us through a vast extent of country, conducting us now beyond the Sutlej into the Panjab, now across the Vindhya mountains into the Dekhan, and now across the Narmada and Godavari to the most southern parts of India, even to the island of Ceylon.' Ikshwaku was its first king, and ruled over a large territory of land, which was known as 'Ikshwaku's dominions,' under which name Rama conveniently includes the country known as Kishkindha and ruled by Vali (*Vide* Kishkindha Kânda, Sarga 18 and Sloka 6). Though Daçaratha boasted to Kaikeyi that his dominions extended as far as 'the wheel of the sun' could go, still he explicitly referred to countries like *Sindhu, Savari, Sourashtra, Dakshinapatha, Vanga, Anga, Maghadha, Matsya, Kasi*, and *Kosala*, over which he claimed a sort of suzerainty, from which he offered to get whatever she might be inclined to command! (Ayodhya Kânda, Sarga X, Sloka 37). But we know that *Anga* was ruled by Romapada, whom he mentions as his friend. But the invitations which Daçaratha issued on the occasion of his great horse sacrifice were confined to the rulers of Mithila, Kasi, Kêkaya, Anga, Sindhu, Savari and Sourashtra, and to many other nameless kings (Bala Kânda, *Sarga* XIII, *Slokas* 21 to 25). The poet's knowledge of this part of the country namely, the region to the north of the Vindhya, is more or less complete and the description of the whole country as detailed by Viswamithra to Rama on their way to Mithila is wonderfully minute. But beyond this, there was the great Dandaka forest infested with deadly reptiles and ferocious beasts of prey, and inhabited by cannibalistic Rakshasas. On the other side of the Sarayu, lived the tribe of the Nishadas, a race of pygmies, whose ruler was Guha and whose capital was *Sringibera.*

An unbiassed study of the poem cannot but convince the reader that the great and perpetual struggle between the Rishis and the Rakshasas was the result of the aggressive colonization by the former, of the territories which were already under the unquestioned occupation of the latter. The great alluvial plains of the south, and the splendid possibilities of colonization in the continuous and beautiful forest with its myriads of flowering plants and fruit trees, and abounding in all sorts of wild game, and with its flowing rivers full of lotuses and lilies and of many varieties of edible fish, very early attracted the Rishis who founded amidst unceasing opposition, many hermitages which were innocently so called but which were really bases of operation against the accredited inhabitants of the plains. What was known as the *Siddhasrama*, originally belonged to the Emperor Bali, probably a very early ruler of the place who was, by inexcusable cunning and under the pretence of mendicancy, subjugated by Vishnu in the guise of a dwarf. Thus probably arose the feuds between the subjects of Bali and these aggressive colonists. Viswamitra whose permanent abode was on the bank of the Kowsi in the Himalayas makes it convenient to come down to the place for performing a sacrifice, although nothing prevented him from doing the same in his own *asrama* and in a more peaceful manner befitting his religious order. The Rakshasas naturally resented this unjustifiable intrusion, which necessitated his applying to Daçaratha for help. Many such hermitages were already founded and were known by the names of those Rishis who, more boldly than others, took to adventures of this kind. These were known as *Bharadwaja* Asrama, *Sarabhanga* Asrama, *Atri* Asrama, *Sutikishna* Asrama, *Matanga* Asrama, *Agastya* Asrama, &c. Beyond these Asramas, there was *Janastana*, the modern Nasik, which was probably the northern confines of Ravana's realm, where was quartered a large contingent of his army, headed by his own brothers *Khara* and *Dusana*, with a view apparently to keep watch over the determined incursions of the Rishis, and of their

docile warrior rulers who were only too ready to carry out whatever they were bidden to do by the Rishis. The Ramayana is nothing but the history of the attempted colonization of a strange country by the Rishis and of the feuds which these bold incursions naturally gave rise to. Far down in the south, on the banks of the Pampâ lake, there was the principality of Kishkindha, of which Vâli was the ruler.

An attempt was made by the poet to put in the mouth of Sugriva a description of the early geography of the world, which is, however, most unreliable, owing to its hopeless exaggerations. But it is interesting to find mention thereof *Cheena* (China) in the north, which probably supplied, from the earliest times, the best silks, which formed the chief raiment of the aristocratic classes. But more trust-worthy is the description of the countries near the Godavery, and the Andhra, Pundra, Chola, Pandya and Kerala kingdoms in the south, where grew the stately cocoa-nut and sandal-wood trees in luxurious abundance. The banks of the *Kaveri* and *Tambraparni* are also referred to as the places where the search party headed by Angada and Hanuman sojourned for a time before they found a clue to the island of Lanka.

Far more instructive is the study of the characteristics of the races of men that came in contact with each other in the course of the story. Broadly speaking, there were the Kshatriya race of the Solar descent, with their family preceptors the Rishis (who were not all Brahmins), the Nishadas, the Vanaras of the Central India, and the so-called Rakshasas who perpetually collided with their militant brethren of the North. The hero of the poem belonged to the Solar race whose origin is traced from Brahma through the Sun-god. But, for all practical purposes, Ikshwaku was the great ancestor who founded the dynasty known after his name. This race was characterised by all those qualities of the head and heart which go to make a great nation. A great line of worthy rulers, their rule was characterised by wise statesmanship and righteous conduct, which endeared them to their

subjects. But the Rishis who were their family priests, and secular advisers as well, early succeeded in encouraging the growth of a sort of superstitious awe for, and in fostering an ever-increasing and servile dependence on, themselves for good and evil alike. The superstitious rulers feared their wrath, though heroic by nature and wise by culture. The Rishis, on their part, showed an inordinate zeal and anxious concern for their welfare and fame. In fact, the solar race owed its glorious successes as well as its ignominious failures to the machinations of these learned men. So far as internal economy was concerned, the Rishis, it must be said to their credit, were eminent for their impartiality, fair-mindedness and justice which was evenly administered between man and man. But, in the management of 'foreign affairs,' they hopelessly lacked that equitableness and fairness which alone secured peace. It was the Rishis that developed the plot which ultimately brought Rama into violent contact with the Rakshasas. When the latter requested their help in finding for him a suitable place in the forest where he could conveniently bide his time during the period of his self-exile, they strategically took him from place to place, till they pointed out Janastana as the best residential quarter for him. He did not know that it was a place thickly populated by the fierce-looking Rakshasas, till he met Sûrpanakha in one of her aimless wanderings. He was looked upon by her with suspicion which soon changed into fierce lust provoked by his handsome person. This part of the story is too well-known to need any recapitulation here. After the obstruction of the whole army of the Rakshasas, the Rishis approached him highly elated at his success and informed him with unconcealed satisfaction that he was most cunningly lured on to this place by them for the purpose of exterminating the cruel and sinful Rakshasas: (*Vide* Aranya Kanda, Sarga XXX and Sloka 31) Rama only too fully realized this, after Sita was taken from him. (Aranya Kanda, Sarga 57, Sloka 9.) They, while jealous of their own possessions, were victim to that 'earth hunger' which really proved a bar to an

otherwise just rule. The Nishadas were an insignificant people who played a very minor part in the development of the story.

The Monkey-tribes, known as the Vânaras, occupied the central plateau of India and were conspicuous for their valour. Their colonies seem to have extended far and wide. Modern research has shown that they belonged to the Kolarian race, which probably represents the earliest settlers in India, whose country was later on encroached upon by the Dravidian races, who were sometimes friendly and sometimes inimical to them. Their stage of civilization could be inferred by the knowledge of the arts displayed by them as described by the poet. It was perhaps their dark and ugly features, smallness of stature, flattened nose, hairy growth and predatory habits, and their occupation of jungly and marshy tracts, shunning the haunts of men that had brought upon them the contempt of their fellow-beings. The Rakshasas are represented as the most hated of the Rishis whom they were not tired of molesting. But the poet showed no prejudice in delineating their characteristics. He displays true historical insight when he depicted them as belonging to a civilization which was in no way inferior to that of the Solar race itself. Occasional relapses into hyperbolical digressions on the part of the poet, such as the representation of the three-headed *Trisiras*. the ten-headed Ravana, the ever-sleepy Kumbakarna, the hideous Surpanakha, were probably intended to excite the flagging interest of the varied readers of this ponderous work with its inevitable repetitions. In the same way, in describing races unknown to the Greeks, such as the Cyclopes, Laestrogones, Centouræ, &c., Homer and other Greek writers are given to exaggeration and relate the most absurd tales. But the Rakshasas seem to have been an enlightened race, whose pugnacity and vindictiveness were due to the provocative depredations of the later Aryan settlers, but who were peaceful citizens in their own country, when left to themselves unmolested and unharassed. (Aranya Kanda,

Sarga XXXVIII, Sloka 24). When Sita heard that Rama had peldged himself at any cost to protect the Rishis from the molestations of the Rakshasas, she very rightly tried her best to dissuade him from undertaking hostilities on their behalf, for which he could plead no sort of justification. She tells him that "an attempt to fight others unprovoked, is one of the three afflictions which man brings on himself by his own wantonness. I do not like the very idea of your entering the forest inhabited by the Rakshasas. I do not like that lives should be sacrificed without any cause for provocation. It is incumbent on you to practise the duty prescribed for those who have vowed to spend their lives in peaceful contemplation. You will please my father-in-law and mother-in-law by following such a duty." (Aranya Kanda, Sarga IX, Slokas 3½ to 32½.) A very sound advice which Rama, however, preferred not to follow because of the promise he had already made to them, without any forethought of the consequences of such an action. In Lanka some of the Rakshasas were very handsome, wise, learned in arts and skilled in Vedic lore. But for his blind and unquenchable lust, Ravana was himself great not only by his vast learning and erudition but also by his tremendous valour and intrepidity which he displayed fearless of its after-results, and which provoked the admiration of his honest foes. There can be no doubt that these Rakshasas were the earliest Aryan settlers in India * which could be proved from the various Aryan customs and manners prevalent among them as described by Valmiki. It is very probable that as Monier Williams thinks, soon after their final occupation of the Gangetic districts, a body of invaders headed by a bold leader such as Ravana, might have forced their way far down into the south of India and into Ceylon. It was as mentioned above, the aggressive spirit of the later Aryan incursionists that was the cause of the conflict between the two branches of the same Aryan stock.

* See note by the Editor in the following page.

The Rakshasas—A Note.

Mr. C. Tirumalayya Naidu 's statement that the Rakshasas were the earliest Aryan settlers in India and were a branch of one and the same Aryan stock, seems to be deduced from the fact of their customs and manners resembling those of the Aryans. But there are many points in the Ramayana itself which clearly assign to theRakshasas a different nationality. They certainly differed from the Aryan invaders as to their origin, civilization and worship.

(1) We know that the Aryans were a white-coloured people; while the Rakshasas are invariably described as a black race. Here, however, the question may be raised that Rama, the hero of the Ramayana, is also described as a black man. This of course is an exceptional case. Besides, as I have elsewhere put it, the author of this popular Epic seems to have had before him an old story of the South which he has grafted upon the story of Rama of Kosala and completed the grand work. the Ramayana. The word Rama itself means "the black one" from the very old Tamilian root *ir* (இர்), "to be darkened." [Though the root is now lost, it survives in the following words: இரா (ira), "night"; இருள் (irul) "dark"; இருந்தை (irundai), "charcoal"; இரும்பு (irumbu), "black metal." (*i. e.* iron); and இராமன் (Raman), "blackman." The feminine of இராமன் (Raman) is இராமாயி (Ramayi) which we find generally used amomg the lower classes, as proper names.] To the oriental mind, the term 'black' is often associated in idea with beauty. So Raman conveys to the mind the idea of a black but fair man, just as the word காரிகை (Karikai) is suggestive of a "black, but fair woman," from the root கரு (Karu) "to blacken."

(2) From the Ramayana we learn that the Rakshasas were a highly civilized people. They had attained a high degree of civilization independently of the Aryans, nay, were even more civilized than the early Aryans. The position assigned to women in the Aryan community was comparatively inferior; among the Rakshasas women held an honourable position.

The ancient Dravidian lady was the mistress of the house and heiress and owner of all property, and she held the right to select her husband at her own choice, known as *Swayamvaram*. But among the Aryans, the marriage system was from very early times *Kanyadhanam*, "giving of the daughter", and heirship was patriarchal From the *Uttarakanda* we learn that Ravana took possession of Lanka by maternal right, for heirship among ancient Dravidians was matriarchal and not as with the Aryan's patriarchal, a clear proof of their different nationality. (See my article on the "Pandavas and the Tamilian Kings", *Tamilian Antiquary*, No. 1, pp. 61—64).

(3) The differences in religion and in worship are also most striking. The Aryans were polytheists and worshippers of heavenly bodies. But the Rakshasas were monotheists and worshippers of Civa, the Supreme Lord of the Dravidas, not included in the Aryan pantheon. Besides, the Aryans were performers of *Yâgas*, while their enemies were destroyers of such bloody sacrifices which were intended to obtain only some material good. The Aryan worship of natural phenomena and their unmeaning sacrifices appeared to the philosophical Tamil mind to be sacrilegious. The Rakshasas as well as the Asuras of olden days—the ancestors of the Tamilian race,—worshipped their Supreme Lord, the God Civa, in the form of a Linga, "emblem" or "image" with incense and flowers, and their ultimate aim was the attainment of heavenly bliss. [See my essays on the "Admixture of Aryan with Tamilian," in the pages of the Siddhanta Deepika, and the Educational Review, for years 1900—1901.]

These are the most striking differences between the two rival races. They show that they represented two different nationalities and that Ravana and his followers belonged to the Asuras or the ancient Tamilians. And I dare say that Mr. Griffith is right when he says: "The people against whom Rama waged war are different in origin, in civilization, and in worship." Though the name Rakshasa became hated,

and contemptible in latter days, it was at first an honorific name and meant " the protectors," equivalent to the Tamilian word காவலர் or புரவலர் which means " protectors of the country." Even the proper names in the Epic are sanskritised by the poet as Ravana, Vibheeshana, Kumba-karna, &c. This cannot lead one to treat them as Aryans, for we see also the names of other peoples who were beyond doubt non-Aryan, sanskritised, as Sugriva, Hanuman, Jadayu, &c. Again, it is an acknowledged fact that the Dravidian ethnologically belongs to the Caucasian melanochroid physical type of the human species, a branch of *Homo Caucasicus* of Mr. Keane. Therefore, there is nothing strange in the remarks of our friend Mr. C.T. Naidu, *viz.*, "In Lanka some of the Rakshasas were very handsome."

If Monier Williams is of the same opinion as our friend Mr. Tirumalayya Naidu, who quotes him, I should say he is wrong. But the text from his "Indian Wisdom" which I beg to quote below, clearly shows that the Author's view about the Rakshasas is different from that of Mr. Tirumalayya Naidu. "It is certainly likely," says M. Williams, " that at some early date, not long after the first settlement of the Aryan races in the country of the five rivers, rival tribes of immigrants, called Kurus, advancing from that region towards the plains of Hindustan, contended for supremacy. It is, moreover, probable that soon after their first occupation of the Gangetic districts, a body of invaders headed by a bold leader, and aided by the warlike but uncivilized hill-tribes, forced their way southwards unto the Peninsula of India as far as Ceylon. The heroic exploits of the chieftains in both cases would naturally become the theme of epic poetry, and the wild Aborigines of the Vindhya and neighbouring hills would be poetically converted into Monkeys, while the powerful Pre-aryan races of the south would be represented as many-headed ogres and blood-thirsty demons................ In the epic poems they are generally called Rakshasas or evil demons, the relentless enemies of Gods and good men and of all sacred rights." (Indian Wisdom, p p. 311-313.)

Editor.

The Morality of the Ramayana.*

BY

Mr. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M.R.A.S.

The late lamented Professor Sundram Pillai of the Trivandram College had, in the course of his extensive study and observation, formed definite opinions on matters connected with his country, but before he was able to give them out to the world, his life was cut short. The following are some of them, known only to a narrow circle of friends. They have been portrayed with Boswellian fidelity in Tamil and published posthumously † by Mr. V. P. Subramanya Moodaliar, one of the Professor's admirers, and himself no mean thinker on social and other allied questions. I have taken the liberty to give to the substance an English garb.

It must be stated, at the outset, that the learned Professor had no faith in the authenticity of the story of the Ramayana. He was of opinion that it was meant to proclaim the prowess of the Aryans and represent their rivals and enemies, the Dravidians, who had attained a high degree of civilization at that period, in the worst possible colour. He offers this criticism taking for granted that the story is founded on facts.

The country, that lies between the Vindhya mountains and the northern limits of H. H. the Nizam's Dominions, was subject to the rule of Ravana, the King of Ceylon, and his sister Surpanaka was in direct charge of it as his vicerine.

* This and the following criticism are reprints from the Malabar Quarterly Review with kind permission. Ed.

† Vide *Tamilian Antiquary*, No. 2. A Critical Review of the Story of the Ramayana, with an introduction by Mr. J. M. Nallasamy Pillai, B.A., B.L., another Dravidian scholar and thinker.

The western portion of it was Janasthanam and the eastern portion Dandakaranyam. The whole place was partly inhabited and partly filled with jungles. The country between this tract and the southern limits of Mysore was ruled by the Dravidian kings, Neelan and Vali. The Peninsula further south was the Tamilagam or Tamil country ruled over by the three Tamil kings, Chera, Chola and Pandiya. Special mention is made by Valmiki of the last-mentioned prince. At this period the Aryans were settling themselves down in the unoccupied portions and their colonies were very few and had not extended to the towns.

The Sovereigns of these countries as well as of Ceylon were Dravidians or of Dravidian extraction. The high standard of morality set up by them and the perfection attained by them in most of the fine-arts are evident signs of the high civilization reached by them. The masterly account of the metropolis of Ravana and of the golden gate of the Pandian fort as given by Valmiki are more than flights of imagination.

Ravana is described as a monster with ten heads and twenty hands, approaching the Grecian Hydra. It has been conclusively proved by Palæontology that animals larger and mightier than elephants were once in existence. But remnants of Rakshasas as those described by Valmiki and his compeers have yet to be found out. It requires no effort to say that the existence of such a class of God's creatures was a myth and the account was made out that the Dravidians might look small in the eyes of posterity. For the same reason the name of Asuras was given to one set of Dravidians. Similarly individuals, belonging to the clan of which Bâli, Sugriva and Hanuman were the leaders, were termed as Monkeys. The Dravidian theory and the existence of the race of ourang-outang have not solved the problem started by the ancient Aryans.

The Devas were none but Aryans, opposed to Asuras and Rakshasas. The sages or *Munies* or *Rishis* were their

priests that accompanied them during their hostile and aggressive march.

Ravana, one of the important characters in the Ramayana was versed in the Vedas and was a staunch believer in Civa. The austere penance performed by him was such as to shake even the very foundations of Mount Kailas. His proficiency in music was so great as even to move Civa. He was a renowned warrior and by his personal valour effected great conquests. He administered his kingdom so well that internal peace was never disturbed. He was a dutiful son, father, husband and brother. He could always be relied upon and maintained the laws of war with honour. He treated his enemies with generosity, nay, with magnanimity.

The other Dravidian princes, such as Bâli and Neelan, were equally accomplished men and bore the highest character. They administered their kingdoms with characteristic justice and impartiality.

The charges against Ravana were:—

(1) That he defeated the celestials and imprisoned them,

(2) That he annoyed the sages while in the performance of their religious rites.

(3) That he abducted Sita, the wife of Rama.

As has already been pointed out, the Devas or celestials did not descend from the heavens, but were only the kith and kin of the Aryan trespassers. Their mission was not friendly and they were in quest of conquest. Ravana would therefore have been justified not only in retarding their progress, but also in carrying the campaign into the enemy's country or Deva Loga. He vanished them in a fair fight and there is nothing unusual in imprisoning prisoners of war.

With regard to the molestation of the Sages, it has already been stated that they were the *Vaidiks* or priestly portion of the Aryan intruders. History has repeated itself over and over again. They were the missionaries that preceded the conquest of Dravida by the Aryans. While performing their religious rites or under that cloak they collected and communicated intelligence regarding the movements of the Dravidians to the enemies of the country. As long as they settled themselves down in Dravida, it was their duty to have conformed to its laws and proved loyal to established authority. They not only failed in their duty, but also proved treacherous. Ravana would therefore have been within his rights, to have put them to the sword, but as a pious devotee of Civa he would not take such an extreme step. He contented himself with only molesting them in the performance of their religious rites, fully believing that they would retrace their steps and finally clear out of the country.

Under the articles of war there appears nothing unusual in the abduction of Sita. When Ravana, the all-powerful King of Ceylon, heard of the affront offered to his sister—one of the first ladies of the realm—he must naturally have been incensed at the ungallant and cowardly act of the polished brothers. It certainly demanded retribution. It is a right of warfare, to seize and carry away any member of the enemy's party, whether actively engaged in fighting or is found as a straggler. In one of the ancient books of moral precepts, it has been stated that it is the right of a victorious general to carry away the wife of the fallen rival. Ravana went with the object of demanding satisfaction, but in the absence of the brothers, he had a free fight with one of their uncles and his horde and after vanquishing them, carried away Sita. It may be said that Ravana was unfair inasmuch as he caused Lakshmana to be decoyed from the place before he entered the presence of Sita. If he had done so, certainly it must have been unfair. But as the whole incident smacks of supernaturalism, it cannot be accepted. Again, Ravana

was in his own dominions, when he heard of the treatment of his sister by Rama and Lakshmana, and he should therefore have advanced towards them with sufficient fighting force. As the insult offered was with impunity, Ravana must naturally have thought that some latent force must have been at the back of the Aryan princes to support them. He should therefore have repaired to the scene with great caution and sufficiently armed. In these circumstances it was unnecessary for him to have allured away Lakshmana.

In treating his prisoner he was very considerate. When Sita was first seized he would not permit any body to touch her person, but caused her to be carried with her seat (?). His further behaviour towards the Princess shows his magnanimity. When she was taken to Lanka she was housed in one of the most beautiful palaces situated in his ornamental garden where he used to repair for health and recreation. Her attendants were the select princesses from the royal family. Though he was passionately in love with Sita he only made overtures directly or indirectly and never thought of using brute force as it was quite in his power to do so. Owing to the conduct of her husband and brother-in-law there were occasions when Ravana could have put her to death, particularly after learning that she would not yield to his wishes for anything under the sun, but his generosity and piety would not permit him to do anything of the kind.

What did the polished Aryan princes do in a similar situation? At the instance of Visvamitra, Rama killed Tadaka, the grand-mother of Ravana, for annoying the priestly class. Again when his sister made love to the brothers passing no doubt all bounds of modesty (if the Aryan Chronicler is to be believed) they not only insulted her, but mutilated her features. This was no act of gallantry and Rama looked at the whole thing with an unconcerned eye, without raising one word of disapproval at the conduct of his brother. Again according to the code of international law there was no declaration of war to warrant such a barbarity which is not heard of even in the

crudest of ages. Rama and his brother were the most polished gentlemen of the age and it is an enigma how they perpetrated such an act of cruelty towards a helpless woman. This is in perfect contrast to the manner in which the so-called monster king behaved himself.

Next to the offences committed by Bâli. As has already been pointed out he was the ruling prince of the country south of Dandakaranyam and the fact was so by right of primogeniture. During a temporary absence from his kingdom, on a pursuit of conquest he left his brother Sugriva in charge of it, as his regent, but on his return he found his unnatural brother ambitious of becoming the King himself and proved refractory by refusing to hand over the reins of Government. Bali had to fight for regaining his Kingdom. The result was the defeat and exile of his brother Sugriva. In a similar situation any other person, take for example Aurangazib, would have made an end of his brother that he might not give trouble again. But his brotherly feeling prevailed upon him to spare his life. The Aryans have found fault with Bâli for all this, but no reasonable man will do so on the facts stated.

It has also been alleged that Bâli took his brother's wife for himself. Even if the authority of the Aryan Chronicler is to be relied upon, the code of warfare permitted such an act on the part of a victorious enemy as has already been stated. But the partisan account has to be taken with caution. The Professor and his friend appear to think that Bâli was generous enough not to molest the household of his erring brother and they chose to remain where they were without following Sugriva in his exile. It is also possible that the members of the family were detained as hostages for his good behaviour.

Before concluding this paper some reference may be made to some minor facts. The Professor and his friend are loud in their condemnation of the alliances formed between Rama and Sugriva, and Rama and Vibheeshana as unnatural

and unbecoming of dignified, straight-forward and gallant Kshatriyas. Here I would draw the special attention of the reader to the part played by Rama during the last and fatal battle that was fought between Bali and Sugriva. While it was raging, from his place of concealment Rama shot Bâli dead. It is unnecessary to repeat that this cowardly conduct is not becoming a Kshatriya. There are stories of Kshatriyas wounded on the back, committing suicide ashamed of meeting their spouses in that condition, as it was considered that only cowards receive such wounds and not heroes who fight face to face. In that light the act of Rama was mean in the extreme and his only object was to secure an alliance at any cost.

Vibheeshana was a great coward in as much as he never took part in any of the battles that were fought betweeen his brother's forces and those of Rama. His services were required by the latter only to ascertain the weak points of his enemy. In other words Rama relied more upon subterfuges than fair open fight which was the Dharma of the Kshatriyas according to Aryan ideas.

Now I have only to submit that in stating these facts the authority of Valmiki alone was relied upon and none else.

"The Morality of the Ramayana" A Review.

BY

Mr. T. SADASIVA AIYER, B. A., M. L.

When I read the article on the above subject by my friend, Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai, in the last issue of the *Malabar Quarterly Review*, an article to which the Editor was pleased to give the leading place in the Magazine, I rubbed my eyes to see that I was not dreaming. I know that the late lamented Mr. Sundaram Pillai, whom I and numerous others used to admire at a distance, had some queer notions about the uselessness of the Sanskrit Vedas, the utter unimportance of intonations in the pronunciation of Mantras, and about the character and signification of Monkeys and Rakshasas in the Ramayana. But even he seemed to have been unwilling or ashamed to publish the crude ideas about the morality of the Ramayana which have now been resuscitated from his manuscripts by Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai and others; or perhaps the learned professor had become doubtful in his ripe manhood of the validity of his criticisms and the utility of publishing them. Those who, like myself, cherish his memory with affection and admiration as a Tamil scholar and antiquarian, a thinker of great originality and a facile wielder of the English tongue, cannot but be pained at this unnecessary publication of his views about the Ramayana after his death.

I am not going to refute the logic and the conclusions of the article. Professor Sundaram Pillai was, I admit, a great and good man, and my friend, Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai, is, no doubt, a worthy disciple of the deceased scholar. But their greatness when compared with Sree Ramachandra's is as a farthing rush-light to the Sun in his mid-day glory, and

their opinions of Sree Rama cannot, of course, affect Sree Rama, who must, no doubt, be greatly amused by His children's prattle about Him. He may be even right glad that some of His children remember and pronounce His Holy Name even if they raise their voices against that name in puny anger and irritation. Valmiki's and Thulasi Das' and Kamban's Ramayanams will not cease to be read and admired by countless future generation to their moral and spiritual benefit as their works have been read in the past; Kabir Das and Ram Das are not going to lose their places in the list of God's Holy Saints; our people from Maharajas down to the humblest menial classes are not going to publish in the next Gazette that they have changed their names from Rama Varma, Ram Chunder Gose, Rama Prasad, Rama Iyer, or Rama Pulaya to Ravana Prasad, Ravana Iyer, etc., the Malayalis are not going to substitute the reading of "Milestones from Tamil History" for the reading of Ezhuthacchan's Ramayana at their *Sambandham* ceremonies, and the Northern Hindus are not going to drop the national greeting of "Ram, Ram," when they meet each other, and the Ramkrishna Mission is not going to call itself the Rakshasa Kamsa Mission; and people are not going to discard *Rama-Nama* as a Tharaka Manthram; none of those things is going to happen owing to the attacks of Professor Sundaram Pillai and Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai on the morality of the Ramayana and owing to the unmanly cowardice and treachery of Sree Rama conclusively proved by their logic. In our younger and wilder days, most of us were inclined to atheism and we took delight in tilting at sacred things and we were incapable of exalting or appreciating one thing without depreciating another. I used in my younger and more foolish days to abuse Sree Krishna and to make fun of His taking birth in a dirty human womb whenever I met a Vaishnava and whenever I wanted to exalt Lord Mahadeva. I have no doubt that I felt at those times greater pleasure in wounding the Vaishnava's feeling than in exalting Lord Mahadeva. But when we have passed a certain age, especially the age of fifty according to our Shastras, or of the age of

fifty-five according to the Civil Service Regulation, we are expected to get rid of these puerile and useless vanities and to speak and write only words useful to the world and not those which can lead only to disunion and strife.

As I said above, I am not going to criticise Mr. Ponnambalam's article in detail. Controversies used to be carried on several years ago in the vernacular between the very learned Somasundara Naicker of Chulai and Sree Srinivasa Sastrial of the Brahma Vidya Press and hard hits used to be given on both sides. Both together used sometimes to join forces to attack their common enemy viz., the Vaishnavas. Such controversies in the vernacular carried on by intellectual giants used to give huge delight to us, lesser mortals, in our younger days, and, as everybody knew that those learned men were fanatics in some respects (both of them, I believe became quite mellowed in spiritual wisdom and became fully tolerant in their last days,) and, as everybody knew that it was a hallowed tradition of vernacular controversies for each side to call the other a fool or a rogue and even to abuse each other's ancestors and relations and to dub the other side's God a fraud so as to add hot condiments and sauce to the dry polemics, readers of such vernacular controversies allowed the usual large discount and took the very valuable and spiritual learning spread out by both sides without their mental digestion being spoiled by the hot fanaticism displayed. But Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai has introduced the same method of controversy in an English article and the Editor has thought it fit to give it a prominent place. May I ask the Editor whether, instead of the Valmiki Ramayanam and Sree Ramachandra's character having been attacked, Lord Jesus or Lord Mahomet, or the Bible or the Koran, had been attacked in an article contributed by one who despised those Great Beings or works, would the Editor have allowed it to appear in his magazine as readily as he (a Hindu) has allowed Mr.Ponnambalam Pillai's resuscitation of Professor Sundaram Pillai's attack on Sree Rama and the Ramayana even without

an editorial note or explanation?* The Editor may be an agnostic or unitarian theist, and yet he would have hesitated before publishing a virulent attack on a Being and work held in religious reverence by millions of his brother men. I shall only add in concluding this portion of my letter that I am unable to see in what parts of Valmiki's Ramayanam he found the following statements referred to in his article. Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai says that in stating his "facts the authority of Valmiki alone was relied upon, and none else;"

a. Ravana "was a dutiful son...husband...brother." "He treated his enemies with generosity,"

b. "Ravana went with the object of demanding satisfaction, but in the absence of the brothers he had a fierce fight with one of their uncles and his horde" (as if Jatayu fought assisted by a horde) "and after vanquishing *them* carried away Sita."

---

* [It is not clear what Mr. T. Sadasiva Aiyar is objecting to. Is it the publication of the article *the Morality of the Ramayana*, in the Review or publishing it in a prominent place or publishing it without an editorial note or explanation? If he thinks that the Editor should have exercised his censorship and refrained from giving publication to such an article, we fear he has completely misunderstood our attitude, which is purely neutral and non-partisan, in an historical controversy of the kind proposed by Mr. T. Ponnambalam Pillai and into which the present writer wants to import the flavour of theological implications. Whoever has known the late Professor Sundaram Pillai and Mr. T. Ponnambalam Pillai has known them as persons who would be the last to wantonly wound the religious susceptibilities of the people. As for ourselves, the very fact that we have published this refutation as readily as we published the original article should be sufficient to show that we are trying, in our own way, to hold the balance even between the opposing views of the Pro-Aryan and Pro-Dravidian scholars. The saying of Aristotle "Socrates is dear to me, Plato is dear to me, but Truth is dearer than all these" must particularly be borne in mind in this connection. About publishing the article as the first in the number, it is scarcely necessary to point out that a journal is not like a lecture-hall where the front seats are reserved for the bigwigs while the common herd is relegated to the back benches and that various are the considerations which weigh with the Editor in determining, or it may be. in not determining, the place of an article in each issue of his journal, and which, we think, need not be detailed out here. Coming to our omission to add an explanatory foot-note, we doubt whether ninty per cent of our contributors would not take such editorial activity amiss and whether from the stand-point of the writers primarily it would not be generally preferable to leave their productions to speak for themselves instead of tagging on to them our individual views. This general consideration apart, there is further the special one that few Editors would or could undertake to have a body of cut and dried opinions on all the conceivable subjects dealt with in their journal.—ED. M. Q. R.]

c. "Thataka" *was* the grand-mother of Ravana."

d. Sugriva was ambitious of becoming the king himself and proved refractory by refusing to hand over the reins of Government; and Vali had to fight for regaining his kingdom.

e. Vibheeshana was a great coward inasmuch as he never took part in any of the battles that were fought between his brother's forces and those of Rama.

f. The country that lies between the Vindhya Mountains and the northern limits of His Highness the Nizam's dominions was subject to the rule of Ravana."

Every one of those statements is directly opposed to Valmiki's version. The very first Sloka in the 5th Chapter of the Bala Kandam of the Ramayanam says that the entire land of India belonged to the Solar line of Kings; and that is also what Sree Rama tells Vali in justification of Vali's punishment as a subject of the Solar Kings and not as an independent chief. Vibheeshana fought strenuously and bravely in Rama's cause and was taunted by Indrajith for so doing and was saved from Ravana's Sakthi (directed against him) by the intervention of Sree Lakshmana. Sugriva did not want to become King, but was pressed by the people to become King, and as soon as Vali came back, surrendered the kingdom and explained matters humbly, and Vali had not at all to fight to regain his kingdom. Thataka was the mother of Mareecha, and she was a Gandharva woman who lost that form through her sin. Ravana was afraid of Sree Rama and Lakshmana and went like a thief to abduct Sita and killed the poor old Jatayu who tried to prevent him. Ravana disobeyed his father's wishes, insulted his brother Kubera and deprived him of his Pushpaka Vimanam; killed his brother's messenger, abducted by force virtuous ladies against the remonstrances of his wife Mandodari. But why should I insult the intelligence of your Hindu readers by contradicting in detail all the wild statements made in the article as if they were taken from Valmiki's Ramayanam?

If Professor Sundram Pillai does not believe in the Ramayanam story at all, as Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai begins by saying in the second para of his article, why should he attack the Aryans on the basis of the allegations in that story after distorting the allegation for his purpose? And if you attack a character as disclosed in a story, is it at all fair or charitable to take certain facts alone as stated in that story as true, to take other statements, which qualify or explain those facts, as false, and then build up a theory? In a very early Chapter (5th) of the very first Kandam of the Ramayana the author Valmiki begins by stating that the Ikshwaku race owned the whole of the land surrounded by seas, and the very name of Dandakaranyam shows (see also the Uttara Ramayanam) its connection with one of the kings of the Solar race. And yet we are gravely told that Sree Rama invaded the Dandakaranya and the Janasthana which belonged to Ravana. Surpanaka, it is said, was a quite innocent and harmless lady and was doing nothing out of the way when her ears were cut off. But Valmiki says that she sprang on Sita and tried to eat her up, as she thought that the only obstacle to Sree Rama's becoming her (Surpanaka's) husband was the existence alive of Sita. (Chapter XVIII, Aranya Kandam). Of course, Valmiki is a liar when he says this, and Professor Sundaram Pillai and Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai have been able to separate this lie from the truthful portions of the narrative, which portions show these learned gentlemen what rascals these Aryans were and what glorious and virtuous people the Rakshasas as a class were with the exception of Vibheeshana and his four ministers. These latter did fight with weapons on Rama's side according to Valmiki. The monkeys who fought on Rama's side were not ordinary monkeys but hybrids born to Devas. Of course all these statements of Valmiki are puerile, worthless, or cunning additions according to Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai, and these monkeys were really Tamil Dravidians. So also, if Vali himself admitted to Sree Ramachandra that he was rightly punished by the Ruling Power at Ayodhya through Sree Rama's hands (see Chapter XVIII, Kishkindha Kandam), this is also a lying

trick of Valmiki. This author is a great fool as well as a great liar according to those who do not believe in Higher Being, Higher Worlds and Subtler Forces and Siddhis than obtain among ordinary men and in the physical world. He seems to admit that *prima facie* Lord Sree Rama's action required justification, but if he was an imaginative liar, why should he not say that Vali was killed in open fight? The Sûkshma Dharma in Valivadham lies, no doubt, very deep. Of course, it is easy to flippantly and conceitedly say that Sree Rama was a wretched selfish man like us and that this is a sufficient explanation for his act. That Vali had warnings from his wife Thara, that Sree Rama was going to deal with Vali's crimes as a King's Officer to a criminal and not as a foe against an independent foe, and that she tried to persuade him to get forgiveness from Sree Rama and thus escape punishment, are told clearly in the Valmiki's Ramayana. We must however be thankful for even small mercies at the hands of these scholars, for they seem not to have attacked the honesty and character of that wretched fool and traitor, Hanuman, who, though a Dravidian, is the head of the Bhakthas of Sree Ramachandra. I know that there are some who think that all my Indian brothers who are now nominally classed as Sudras, though most of them are Vaisyas and some of them ought to be classed as Kshathriyas and Brahmins,—but that is another story—do not belong to the Aryan race. It is not improbable that the Vellala and Naga races were originally races not belonging to the Fifth Arya race, but to a later branch of the later Fourth Turanian Race, that branch being called Dravidians. The Fifth Arya Race itself was selected out of the flower of the earlier Fourth Race. But the Aryan race itself had developed all the four castes long before Sree Rama's days. At first, there was only one caste, and then three castes arose, and lastly four castes. The Sudras of the United Provinces and Bombay cannot be said to be Dravidians, Vellalas, or Nagas. Many conquered and indigenous races belonging to an earlier civilization must, of course, have also been taken into the Aryan

Caste system afterwards. Some of the more enlightened and religious members belonging to such indigenous races were incorporated, as even Kshathriyas and Vysias. But the ambition of many of my Southern Vellala friends and of the so-called non-Brahmin portion of our community in the southern portions of India to now cut themselves entirely adrift from Sree Rama and Sree Krishna and the Sanskrit Vedas and the Thiruvaimozhi Prabandham and to rise a standard of revolt on a pure Tamil Saivite anti-Brahmin and non-Aryan basis, is, if I may be permitted to say so, an utter wildgoose chase. I do not mean, of course, to say that the Saiva Siddhantha Religion of Philosophical Devotion so splendidly expounded by my brother J. M. Nallasamy Pillai, which is the same as the religion of the *Gita* with slight variations of terminology, is at all opposed to the Arya Vedas and Shasthras. The non-Brahmin Alwars who have been devotees of Sree Rama and Sree Krishna are infinitely more powerful than my modern Tamil friends of the type of Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai, intellectual giants of vast learning, though many of these latter may be.

We have already got strife and division enough among us. A new religious sect based not on the enunciation of a new spiritual truth but on critical attack of the Ramayana and of Sree Rama's character need not be set up to cause further strife and dissension among us. The political, antiquarian, and religious importance of the Vellala community and the great beauty and spirituality of the Tamil Sacred Literature need not be founded on attacks upon the Ramayana and the morality of the Aryan races, to which most so-called Sudras belong either wholly as in the north or by a large infusion of Aryan blood as in Malabar, and we know how in the political field the assertion of superiority in political status and loyalty and character by a section of Indians is embarassing and delaying the introduction of Lord Morley's Reforms. Fanaticism and extremism in political, social, and religious matters though better than death and

apathy, are not at all desirable things in themselves, and as it seemed to me to be the duty of every sober critic to try his best to put down the rising flames raised in these fields in respectable Journals and Magazines before the flames spread havoc and as soon they have done their work of giving warmth and life to chilled and numbed limbs, I have ventured to write this imperfect protest during the few snatches of leisure I am able to secure, against the implications contained in the article of my friend Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai, whose hand has been probably utilised half-unconsciously to himself by a mischievous Spirit from another world bent on showing discord and disunion among us.

When I refer to the Ramayana of Valmiki as a Spiritual Work and also as a Historical narrative, I, of course, do not intend to state that the work (every word and letter of it) has come down to us as it was first expressed to his disciples, Bharadwaja and others, by the great Sage. As a reviewer in the *Hindu* of 20th July last put it: "notwithstanding the ravages of time, it has come down to us with" (practically) "unsullied purity, though interpolations of a marked character *are inevitable in a work so huge and stupendous in character*," But to first state the whole thing to be a fiction, then to select garbled and isolated passages and incidents as if they alone were genuine and showed the morality and spirituality of the Author's work and of the hero of the work, instead of taking the pervading and clearly recognisable trend and spirit of the whole, are, I must repeat, grossly unfair and show a mind diseased by inveterate and bigoted prejudice against the very name "Aryan."

The Morality of the Ramayana—A Rejoinder.

BY

MR. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M. R. A. S.

In preparing my paper on *the Morality of Ramayana,* to the "Malabar Quarterly Review" I intended to interpret the views of the late professor Sundaram Pillai, to a larger circle of readers than the *Tamil* article, in the *Tamilian Antiquary,* (No. 2), was able to command, in order to elicit rational criticism, in the interests of the Southern Indian History. As education advances it is but natural that investigations into the history of one's own land, particularly if it is enveloped in mystery, should be made. At all events, such a spirit pervades at present the minds of all educated men both in Southern India and Ceylon, where most of the scenes in the Ramayana have been laid. If in the course of such a legitimate enquiry old ideas are exploded, all right thinking people ought to welcome such a healthy change, and sympathise with the workers in their difficult labours. In the place of such generous treatment, I least expected a furious, but a pointless attack, from the pen of Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, the talented Chief Justice of Travancore, who is known for his perfect equanimity of temper, and who until now never permitted it to be ruffled by anything, as became an arbiter of Justice in the Highest Court of the kingdom. I also regret, that in the heat of the fight he should have so forgotten himself, as to introduce into the arena of discussion, a large number of unparliamentary expressions (about 40 in number besides unlimited inuendoes), thus following the vernacular controversies he has condemned after taking exception to my using certain strong terms; and as a crowning act, that he should have suggested, that some evil spirit, probably from the nether world, impelled me to set my pen to the article in question.

What I regret more than anything, is his reference to my motives, and the introduction of politics into the review of my paper. In the first place, it is hard that I should be denounced, as attacking a class, if in the course of making a statement of certain historical facts, it is placed in an unfavourable light. In the next place, it was in no light-hearted-mood, or with the object of ridiculing the worship of Rama, that I penned the article which Mr. Sadasiva Iyer criticises. I should perhaps have added the warning with which Mr. V.P. Subramania Mudaliar, the author of the Tamil version prefaced it, *viz.* that it was only an historical aspect of the question.

It is however gratifying to me that my reviewer credits me with the Saiva Siddhantha faith. The broad and cosmopolitan principles which it inculcates are embodied in the following stanza of the *Kanda-Purana*(தக்ஷ காண்டம், தக்ஷவிரதப்படலம்.)

எவ்வெவர் தம்மையேனும் யாவரே யெனினும் போற்றின்,
அவ்வவரிடமாக் கொண்டே, யவர்க்கருள் தருவாய் போற்றி,
மெய்வரு தெளிவி லுன்னை வெளிப்படவுணர்ந்துள் ளோர்க்குத்,
தெய்வத போக முத்தி சிறப்பொடு தருவாய் போற்றி."

"Whosoever may worship Thee in whatsoever aspect, Thou wilt present Thyself as such, and grant him grace. To those that understand Thee aright, Thou wouldst grant beatitude gracefully. I adore such a Deity." If I adhere to these views (and I assure my readers that I do) I cannot consistently trifle with the faith inculcated in the Ramayana, and will not directly, or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, indulge in such a treatment as that with which I have been fathered by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer; though it is a difficult thing to question the absurdities and supernaturalisms that have been smuggled into it by some of its deluded votaries.

To construct a reliable history of Southern India constant reference has to be made to the Ramayana, one of the few sources of ancient record. But dealing, as it does, with hoary antiquity, garbed as the facts are in our inherent national hyperbole, drawn as the imageries are in such a way as to border

upon mythology, and unrestrained as the chroniclers are in their indulgence to the fullest extent, in the license which poetry permits, it should be the endeavour of every sane man to allow the facts to be treated as historical truths, to be put to a crucial scientific test. It is my humble, but my firm belief, that this test consists in courting healthy and open criticism of all doubtful facts. This is an experience not at all foreign to my critic, who had large experience as a Judicial Officer. In performing this task, if I am charged with the offence of disturbing the established faith, my reply is that the end justifies the means.

Now as to politics. I repeat that I regret the introduction of this subject into the discussion. I have always had a natural disinclination to discuss it, and the unfortunate condition of India at the present moment makes any reference to the topic unsavory. If I am compelled to enter the lists, Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar alone is responsible for my doing so. In the course of his criticism, he says that the delay in the introduction of Lord Morley's reforms is due to the conduct of people like my humble self. But as is evident from the published reports, it is due to that generous spirit which prompted the benign British Government to launch the whole scheme. Here I must digress for a moment to explain myself and to enable Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar to refresh his memory in the study of ancient history.* ....

I think I should make one more preliminary observation, before proceeding to the discussion of the main subject, in order to correct what I may term, a historical solecism. Mr. Sadasiva Iyer speaks in a patronising tone saying that certain Dravidian friends of his, ought to be counted as Brahmins and Kshatrias and I believe if he had the power he would have raised them to that dignity. He further adds that there is a large infusion of Aryan blood amongst the Dravidians, but failed to state the reverse. It has

* [We have omitted the paragraphs which follow this, as the policy of our journal prohibits publishing discussions of this kind. Ed.]

already been pointed out,* that when the Aryans entered Northern India, they did so as conquerors and not as peaceful emigrants, though at a later stage they became identified with the races already in possession of the land. But it was the other way when they entered Southern India, and they were enabled to do so only by the sufferance of the Dravidians. I make this statement on the authority of the Ramayana itself. During his exile, when Rama travelled from place to place he took care to ascertain, where to get lodgings for himself and his two relations from friendly people, and how to protect themselves from man and beast (*vide* canto 54 Ayodyakanda). Again the fact that Agastia, the sage, was constantly subject to attacks from such individuals, as Sutha, the husband of Tadaka, Tadaka herself, and her son Mareecha (canto 25, Balakanda), that the sages at Chitrakuta had to abandon their dwellings owing to the ill-treatment of Kara of Janasthana, that Rama was able only to hear their complaints and sympathise with them (canto 116, Ayodyakanda) and that he had clandestinely to make an alliance with Sugriva at the Rishyamuka Ranges, while Vali more powerful than Ravana was holding undisputed sway over Kishkintha (canto 10, Kishkinthakanda), go to show that that the Aryans were dependent upon the pleasure of, and seekers of favour from, the permanent dwellers of the soil. In these circumstances, they would only have been too glad to enter into close relationship with the all-powerful natives. Mr. Sadasiva Iyer makes a serious admission. For he says "that many conquered and indigenous races belonging to an earlier civilization must of course have been taken into Aryan caste system. Some of the more enlightened and religious members belonging to such indigenous races, were incorporated as even Kshatrias and Vysias"; and I ask why not as Brahmins?

The statement made by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer is an historical truth, as the result of the evolution of the society, when

* See pages 47-50 of the Malabar Quarterly Review, Vol. IX. No. 1 March, 1910.

an emigrant people mix with a resident population. It has been authoritatively established, that the Dravidians were not the indigenous races of Southern India. They belong to an earlier wave of emigration, and in all probability, the first batch of them crossed over by sea from Western Asia, as is evident from their skill as sailors. Notwithstanding the nick-names of giants and monkeys given to them by the Aryans, the description given in the Ramayana of their cities and buildings, the high standard of morality observed by the generality of them, and the state of efficiency and discipline in which their armies were maintained, go to show the high level of civilization attained by them. This was their condition when the Aryans crossed the Indus (*vide* Vedic India Page 291). After centuries when they advanced towards the south, though there were the usual bickerings in the beginning, both the races became reconciled to each other, and identified with one another, so as to form a single nation. From what has fallen from Kiplar, a poet of the last Academy at Madura, it seems that the caste system was introduced into Southern India at a late stage. Addressing the Aryans in his famous Agaval, he bitterly complains of it and says. நாற்குலஜாதி யிந்நாட்டில் நீர் நாட்டினீர், "you established the system of four castes into this country."

From the above it is evident that both the races were fused together into one, and subsequently the division of caste was initiated. In that case the Dravidians must have become not only Kshatrias and Vysias, but also Brahmins, as was the case with the Non-aryan Indians of Northern India like Viswamithra, Vyasa and Valmeeki. There are modern parallels to this historic fact in other parts of the world, and mention may be made of the case of Boers and British settlers in South Africa. From these facts, it is patent that not only Aryan blood flows freely in the veins of the Dravidians, but the reverse is also the case. I cannot but observe here, that I was compelled to discuss this question at this length by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, and in doing so, I have not intended offence to anybody.

Before entering upon the main question, I must at the outset point out that when I penned my article on the Ramayana, I had expressly stated that I had given an English garb to the ideas of Professor Sundaram Pillai as clothed in Tamil by my friend Mr. V. P. Subramania Mudaliar. As the late professor and myself have since been taken to task, I propose to accept all responsibility and with the assistance of Mr. Subramania Mudaliar, to meet, as much as it lies in our power, the attack conceived and levelled in an unfair and illiberal spirit by my critic, though not with that clearness of thought, and felicity of diction, which characterised the writings of the late Mr. Sundaram Pillai.

It has been admitted on all hands that the late lamented professor was a profound scholar, an archœologist, and a thinker of no mean order. If, therefore, on a set of given facts he arrived at a conclusion, which satisfies any reasonable mind, it is hard to find fault with him. With regard to his want of faith in the Ramayana, it continued up to the day of his death, as will be seen from the introduction to the *Tamilian Antiquary,* No. 2, by Mr. J. M. Nallaswamy Pillai, B. A., B. L. I may also state here that in this disbelief he stood in good company, for Mr. R. C. Dutt, whose recent irreparable loss is mourned throughout the length and breadth of India, whose right to fame as a scholar and savant of European reputation, is greater than that of Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, and whose admiration for the sublime portions of the Ramayana is second to none, has delivered himself as follows.

"Like the Mahabaratha, the Ramayana is utterly value-less as a narrative of historical events and incidents. As in the Mahabaratha, so in the Ramayana, the heroes are myths pure and simple."

"Sita, the field furrow, had received divine honours from the time of the Rig Veda, and had been worshipped as a goddess. When cultivation gradually spread in Southern India, it was not difficult to invent a political myth that Sita

was carried to the South. And when she is goddess and women,—the noblest creation of human imagination,—had acquired a distinct and lovely individuality, she was naturally described as the daughter of the holiest and most learned king on record, Janaka of the Videhas."

" But who is Rama, described in the epic as Sita's husband and the king of the Kosalas? The later Puranas tell us that he was an incarnation of Vishnu, but Vishnu himself had not risen to prominence at the time of which we are speaking. Indra was still the chief of the Gods of the Epic period. And in the Sutra literature (e. g. Paraskara Grihya Sutra II, 17, 9) we learn that Sita, the furrow goddess, is the wife of Indra. Is it then an untenable conjecture that Rama, the hero of the Ramayana, is in his original conception, like Arjuna the hero of the Mahabaratha, only a new edition of Indra battling with the demons of drought. The myth of Indra has thus been mixed up with the epic which describes as an historic war in Northern India, and with the epic which describes the historic conquest of Southern India." (Dutt's Early Hindu Civilization, Vol. I, page 138.)

As the morality of the Ramayana rests chiefly on the conduct of the leading Aryan heroes and their confederates, I have touched on the following points in my first article, though incidentally minor questions have been discussed.

(1) The conduct of Vâli, or Bâli and Sugrîva, towards each other, and their character.

(2) The nature of the alliance between the latter and Rama.

(3) The conduct of Ravana and Vibhishana, towards each other, and their character.

(4) The nature of the alliance between the latter and Rama.

(5) The existence of the beings called Rakshasas, Asuras, Devas and Vânaras.

Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, who has discovered in my paper an attack levelled against his class, and has therefore taken up the gauntlet on their behalf, begins by stating that he does not propose to refute my arguments in detail. The reason assigned for this omission is the want of time—a subterfuge generally adopted by less subtle things. To my mind it is impossible to meet some of the questions raised by my friends, and the presumption of the omission is no doubt in my favour. He not only passes over most of the points noted above, but altogether refrains from dwelling on the existence or otherwise of the beings called Rakshasas (Giants), Asurars (Demons), Devas (Celestials) and Vanarars (Men with tails), and raises certain side issues such as the relationship between Ravana and Tataka and the overlordship of Janasthana and Dandakaranya.

One of the greatest charges levelled against us is, that we have misrepresented matters, by referring to information that does not find a place in the Ramayana of Valmeeki. Mr. Sadasiva Iyer refers to Thulasiram's, Kamban's, and Eluthachan's, and other renderings of the epic. Referring to the same subject, my friend Mr. Subramania Mudaliar says, that though the Ramayana has been translated into all the Indian languages, whenever a person speaks of it, it is generally supposed to be that of the Valmeeki (vide p. iii, preface No. 2 *Tamilian Antiquary*). It is in that strain we have spoken of it, and as far as I have investigated, there is no material difference between the original work and the Ramayana of Kamban with which my friends and myself are familiar. Even granting that there were misquotations, with regard to the particular items referred to by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, I do not think that they have affected in any way the main questions. Notwithstanding the taunts and inuendoes directed at us by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, all right-minded people will agree in thinking that the story of the Aryan Chronicler should be accepted with caution. For, in my first article I pointed out that it was a partisan account and the object of the thesis was to enhance the reputation of his compeers at the expense of their adversaries.

With this introduction I shall deal with the various questions at issue. But it will be more convenient to dispose of some of the minor points—particularly the overlordship of Dandakaranya and Janasthana, and the relationship between Ravana and Tataka,—before dwelling with the main ones, as Mr. Sadasiva Iyer seems to attach much importance to their determination.

With regard to the first, Mr. Sadasiva Iyer firmly believes that both provinces were under the suzerainty of the empire of Dasaratha, and in support of the contention quotes Canto V. of the Balakanda. In doing so he says, "that the entire land of India belonged to the Solar Race of kings", and he adds "that the Ikshvaku's race owned the whole of the land surrounded by seas." There can be no doubt that Mr. Sadasiva Iyer intended to convey identically the same meaning by the two extracts under marks of quotation, but the words employed do not import it. The first means that the Solar dynasty reigned over the whole of India, while the other means over the whole world. On looking through the metric translation of Valmeeki into English by professor Griffiths, and that of Mr. Natesa Sastry into Tamil prose, I find that the poet meant the whole world. If his words are to be construed literally, the undoubted existence of a Chaldean, an Assyrian, a Babylonian, a Persian, an Egyptian, and a Chinese Empire in times of yore must be untrue, and the mythological imageries of a rhapsodist alone should be held as true. But I have my doubts as to whether the spirit of the age would permit the whole-sale swallowing of patent absurdities of this kind.

There is enough of internal evidence in the Ramayana itself to prove that the Kosala empire did not extend to Southern India, so as to include Dandakaranya and Janasthana. The following are some of the facts which may be urged in support of the contention :—

(1) That from the same authority quoted by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer (vide canto V of Balakanda) Kosala was a small kingdom, on the banks of Sarayu.

(2) That Janaka, king of Mithila, was of the same status as that of Dasaratha and was not a tributary sovereign (as my critic would have us believe) to the Emperor of India. (vide canto 70 and 71 of Balakanda).

(3) That the abject manner in which Dasaratha in conjunction with the sages, entreated Parasurama not to molest his son Rama, on his way back to Ayodhyah, after his marriage with Sita, does not show that he was the all-powerful Emperor of India (vide canto 65, Balakanda.)

(4) That when Rama, the heir to the throne, passed the confines of Kosala after his exile, he had to receive instructions with regard to the geographical position of the places he had to visit and the people inhabiting them. This ignorance is inexcusable in the future Emperor (vide cantos 54 and 55, Ayodhyah Kanda, and the earlier cantos of Aranyakanda.)

(5) The helpless condition in which Rama— the avenger of the wrongs of everybody under the sun—found himself when the sages resident at Chitrakuta complained to him of illtreatment offered to them by Kara— a cousin of Ravana and chief minister of Surpanaka— sallying forth his post at Janasthana, and the complacent manner in which he was compelled to witness their departure to a safe retreat at a great distance (vide canto 116, Ayodhyah Kanda).

(6) That there was a settled Government at Janasthana coupled with Dandakaranya, at the head of which was Surpanaka with Kara as her chief adviser, and Dushana as Commander-in-chief of an armed force of 14,000 picked men. (Vide cantos 12 to 30 Aranyakanda, and canto 29 Uttarakanda.)

(7) That when Akamban and Surpanaka sped to Lanka from Janasthana and reported to Ravana that

"Rama was there to strike and slay
"By him, O! King of high estate,
"Is Janasthana left desolate."

Canto 31, Aranyakanda.

"Know Rama with his conquering arm
"Has freed the saints, from dread of harm,
"Has smitten Janasthana and made
"Asylum safe in Dandaka's shade."

Canto 33, Aranyakanda.

their feeling was that the provinces were subject to the rule of Ravana.

(8) That on being informed of the desolate condition in which Janasthana "that feared no hate of foes" and Dandakaranya were laid, his feeling enquiries, quoted below, serve as an index of his sway.

" What fool has dared, already dead
" Strike Janasthana, the general dread ?

Canto 31, Aranyakanda.

Who is this Rama..............what purpose led to Dandaka forest, hard to tread ?

Canto 34, Aranyakanda.

...........did Rama seek the shade of Janasthana with Indra's aid ?

Canto 31, Aranyakanda.

(9) That in discussing the subject with Mareecha, the great anxiety with which he declaims thus :—

" My generous, the bravest of my band
" Are slain by Rama's vigorous hand
" And Janasthana that feared no hate
" Of foes, is rendered desolate."

Canto 31, Aranyakanda.

exhibits the sense of his authority.

The foregoing facts prove clearly:—

(1) That the kingdom of Kosala was limited in extent.

(2) That there were kings of the same status as Dasaratha and they were not tributaries to him, and he could not therefore have been Emperor of India.

(3) That Janasthana and Dandakaranya were under the undisputed sway of Ravana, and the least interference from outside exasperated him.

Now let us see whether there is any evidence, outside the Ramayana. It has already been noted that Janaka, the father of Sita, was the contemporary of Dasaratha. According to historical researches Videhas, Kosalas and Kasis were powerful and civilised kingdoms established east of the Ganges, and Janaka, the ruler of the first named of them was the most powerful of all the kings. "That monarch had not only established his power in the farthest confines of the Hindu dominions in India," but had also started "speculations enquiring" about the "destination of the soul, and the nature of the supreme being," so as to find a permanent place for himself in the Upanishads (*vide* Dutt's Early Hindu civilization Vol., I, Book II, Chapter III.) If Dasaratha was a contemporary of Janaka, the latter was certainly a more powerful king, and if an emperor was to be elected the choice would certainly have fallen on him. With regard to the identity of Janaka there is no doubt, for the pedigree given in Canto 71 of the Bala-kanda makes no mention of any other king of the line by the same name. But the most important fact that has to be determined is the extent of the Hindu Aryan world at the time we are speaking of. From chapter V of the same volume and book, it is seen that proceeding from the banks of the Indus on the west, the Aryans had settled themselves down in the tracts watered by the Ganges and the Jumna by the year 1000 B. C. and the kingdom referred to above was the newest and the latest of the Hindu kingdoms. "Beyond this wide tract of Hindu kingdoms lay the whole extent of India yet unexplored or rather unconquered by the Aryans, and peopled by various aboriginal tribes. A wide belt of this non-aryan tract surrounding the Hindu world to the east, south and west was becoming known to the Hindus about the close of

the epic period. South Behar, Malwa and a portion of the Deccan, the regions to the south of the Rajaputana desert, formed a wide semicircular belt of country as yet not hinduised, but becoming gradually known to the Hindus" (Chapter IV of the same Book). Thus the limits of the Aryan world did not go beyond the Vindhya Range.

This state of things existed, as I have already pointed out, about 1000 B. C. We must now see when further expansion of the Aryan India was made. Boudhayana who flourished much later, probably about the sixth century B. C., and who was one of the founders of the Sutra-school fixes the following boundaries as those of Aryavarta or the country of the Aryans, *viz.*

North..............................Hymalayas.
East.................................Behar.
South...............................Vindhya Ranges.
West................................The Saraswati.

and prescribes a penalty in the form of a sacrifice for the absolution of the sin of crossing them (Boudhayana I., 1 and 2, as quoted by Dutt Vol. 1. page 214). Thus for religious more than political reasons, which were subordinated, the limits of Aryan India were not permitted to be extended beyond the Vindhya Mountains.

At the time of the invasion of India about the year 327 B.C. by Alexander the Great, Chandraguptha was the most powerful Aryan king, and his dominions included most of the portions of Northern India which are at present ruled over by four Lieutenant Governors and a Chief Commissioner. Portions of Bengal, Orissa and the Central Provinces formed the Kalingah kingdom, and south of it was the Andhrah kingdom extending up to the banks of the Krishna. Later on, when the great Asoka succeeded his father, the son of Chandraguptha, he absorbed all the surrounding territories; but the limits of his empire did not advance further than those of Andhrah, for his Edicts No, II places the Chola, the

Pandya and Chera kingdoms beyond the frontier of the Empire, and they are treated as foreign and independent potentates.

Thus, step by step, I have striven to show that the Kosala Empire did not reach that limit claimed by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, at any time; if, at such a late period as the middle of the third century B. C., the limit of the territories of a powerful monarch could not have gone beyond the river Krishna, it stands to reason that at an earlier period when there was no desire for conquest, and the chivalrous feats attributed to Rama were mostly in self-defence, Dandakaranya and Janasthana did not form part of the imaginary empire of Dasaratha. I cannot but remark here, with greater men than myself, that Valmiki was not a contemporary of Rama, and in elaborating a story he had heard from Narada and supplimented by Brahma, he drew as much as possible from his imagination, and was therefore guilty of the sin of anachronism.

With regard to Tadaka, there is no doubt, that she was originally a Gandharva woman—a name given by the Aryans to some of the non-aryan races; but, as pointed out by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer, she laterly embraced the faith of the Rakshasas with her whole family, and became identified with them. According to Valmeeki she was the wife of a Yaksha by name Sutha, and as he wantonly destroyed the garden of Agastya, he was reduced to ashes by him. Enraged at this she and her son Mareecha repaired to the scene of this catastrophe to wreak vengeance, but on their appearance they were cursed to assume the form of Rakshasas. After this event she went on with her depredations, as usual with women of her class and strength; and proved a terror to the sages resorting to the forests of Malasam and Karusam, not far away from the Southern banks of the Ganges. Amongst others she molested Visvamithra in the performance of his great sacrifice. The first mission of the youthful Rama was to destroy this giantess (vide cantos 24 and 25, Balakanda.)

After this event, we next hear of Mareecha in Janasthana in the service of Ravana. As belonging to the class of Rakshasas, Tadaka and Mareecha had community of interest with Ravana and other fellow Rakshasas. As Tadaka was a princess and a leading member of one of the clans of Rakshasas, it is but natural that her death, by the hand of Rama, must have been working in the mind of Ravana, and if he had taken any steps to avenge it, it would have been justifiable. The Tamil poet Kamban who drew his inspiration from three Sanskrit works, including that of Valmiki, states that after the death of his father, Mareecha and his brother were adopted by Sumali, the maternal grandfather of Ravana, as his children, and thus they became the uncles of Ravana (*Vide* Balakandam). In this case Tadaka was in the relationship of a grand parent to Ravana. But this is a matter that does not affect the main subject of controversy.

Bâli, or Vali, Sugriva, and Rama.—In discussing their character, it appears to me necessary to state the facts at length as recorded by Valmiki, that there may be no misconception. Of the two brothers, Vali was the elder and Sugriva the younger. The former was sitting on the throne of his ancestors, at the time of the visit of Rama and Lakshmana, by right of primogeniture, and Sugriva was in exile in the Rishyamukha Hills. Long before his banishment, when he was living with his brother on friendly terms, on a certain night, an Asura by name Mâyâvi repaired to the gates of Kishkinda and challenged Vali to fight, owing to some love affair. In spite of the advice of all interested in him, including Sugriva, he accepted the challenge, and ran out to meet him. Out of affection and regard, Sugriva followed him. At the sight of the brothers, the demon fled for his life, and took refuge in a cave. Disappointed as Vali was, he was not prepared to give up the chase. He turned to his brother and asked him to watch the mouth of the cave carefully, till his return. Sugriva tried to dissuade him from his impetuous course, but Vali was inexorable and made his brother swear by his feet that he would carry out his injunctions. He tarried

at the entrance to the cave, for one full year, and the only signs of life there were the roaring sound of Mayavi, and the streaming of frothy blood from the cave. Sugriva concluded that his brother was dead, shut up the cave with a stone "as huge as a hill", performed his last rites, returned to Kishkinda and refrained from mentioning the facts to anybody. But the ministers of Vali learned them, and, in consultation with the people, installed him on the throne of his brother. While he was thus reigning, Vali returned to the mouth of the cave, found it barred, and called Sugriva by name. But as there was no response he was in a state of despair. With a great effort he kicked away the stone and betook himself to Kishkinda. On the reappearance of his brother, Sugriva surrendered the crown, explained to him that it was set on his head, for the defence of the kingdom, tried to propitiate him, and besought him to forgive him. But Vali was not appeased. He slew the ministers who were instrumental in placing his brother on the throne, deprived Sugriva of his wife and banished him from the kingdom with only a strip of cloth round his loins. From that time, up to the moment of the arrival of Rama and Lakshmana, he was living on the Rishiyamuka Hills, which Vali was debarred from approaching, owing to an imprecation on the part of sage Mathanga (Cantos 9 and 10, Kishkindha kanda).

After the abduction of Sita, when the brothers were at their wits' end to find out its author, and her whereabouts, they appealed to Kabandha who had assumed the celestial form of Danu, and he directed them to go to Kishkindha, and seek the aid of Sugriva, who was in the same plight as Rama was (vide canto 73 Aranya Kanda). On their arrival at the Malaya hills in the Mathanga forests, the brothers were anxious to seek an interview with Sugriva, but he espying them from a distance took them for Vali's spies in disguise, and took the necessary precautions to guard himself and his friends against any untoward danger. After, however, holding counsel with his brethren in adversity (for there were some who were sent into exile at the same time with Sugriva,

such as Hanuman, Nalan, Neelan, &c.,) he made up his mind to depute Hanuman to go to the youthful heroes, learn the object of their mission, and secure if possible their assistance in encompassing the death of Vali and ending his tyrannical rule. His mission was successful. Hanuman went in the guise of mendicant, reconnoitered the position, and finding that there was nothing suspicious, he informed them of the object of his visit, which was of course quite welcome to them. Rama and Lakshmana at once, in the company of Hanuman, proceeded to the residence of Sugriva, and concluded a defensive and offensive alliance. The object of this was, that Rama should bring about the death of Vali, and place Sugriva on his throne. The latter was on his part to assist him in the recovery of Sita (Cantos 2 to 6, Kishkindhakanda).

The next step was the fulfilment of the promises. Impelled by Rama, Sugriva led his friends to Kishkindha. and while they remained concealed in a dense wood, he raised the usual war cry and challenged Vali to combat. He accepted the challenge, fought with his usual bravery, and discomfitted Sugriva, who having had no aid from Rama, fled into the Mathanga forests. As has already been pointed out, Vali was compelled to give up pursuit, owing to the interdict placed against him to enter it. Rama, Lakshmana and other friends followed Sugriva to the grove. On their approach, he taunted Rama with practising deceit on him, by failing to perform his part of the promise. Rama explained, that while the brothers were fighting the dual, he was not able to detect a shade of difference between them, and he had therefore to refrain from discharging his arrow at Vali for fear of killing him. In order to distinguish one from the other, he directed Lakshmana to throw round the neck of Sugriva a wreath of creepers with crimson flowers on, and desired him to go back to Kishkindha and challenge Vali again for combat. While he readily did so, Rama and his brother remained in the sacred grove, watching what was going on in the battle-field (canto 12, Kishkindhakanda.) Vali did not hesitate to encounter Sugriva a second time, notwithstanding the entreaties of

his chief and favourite Queen Tara, not to fight his brother on that inauspicious day. He passed out of the portals of his palace, and took up the gauntlet. The combat was fought most fiercely, but with varying success, till at length Rama observing his friend staggering under the blows of " the conquering foe " laid his hand on his bow strings, and aimed his arrow at the breast of Vali. It pierced his heart unswervingly, and with the arrow implanted in his heart, he reeled and fell. (*Canto 16, Kishkindhakanda.*)

I have given this account at length as it is not available to the ordinary reader. As Mr. Sadasiva Iyer is anxious to justify the conduct of Rama and Sugriva, he should be in a position to judge for himself. The first and foremost breach of propriety on the part of Sugriva was the desertion of his post. He had the whole kingdom at his back, and he was consequently in a position to command all conveniences for staying at the mouth of the cave, for any length of time. If he was tired of his duty, he could at least have put some of his trusted followers at the post such as Hanuman, Nala, and Neelan, who later on in the war with Ravana performed great exploits. In the next place the indecent haste with which he arrived at the conclusion, that his brother was dead, does not prove his *bona fides*. He relied upon conjectures rather than satisfying himself with practical proof. His intimate friend and Lieutenant Hanuman, was known to possess prodigious powers, so that he could assume any shape, attain any speed and stalk over the sphere—the celestial and nether worlds included. An individual like this could have been sent at the head of a search party, before Sugriva assumed regal powers. Thirdly, his closing the cavern with a huge stone, does not demonstrate that he was innocent. That act only goes to show, that he did not wish Vali his brother and king to return. Fourthly, his silence was more than criminal. If he had given the necessary information to those more interested than himself, such as the queens of Vali and his son Angada, they would have set people to look

for him. Lastly even granting that the interests of the kingdom required the presence of a king, his duty was to place his nephew on the throne, and act as his guardian, or the regent. The will of the people as suggested by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer had nothing to do in a country where the law of Primogeniture prevailed, and this fact was admitted to Rama by Sugriva. It was, moreover, decided by the behest of Rama, to make Angada the heir-apparent to the throne, and Sugriva implicitly obeyed his wishes. The late Mr. Dutt has put the matter most graphically thus.

> "Gallant Angada, son of Bali is in regal
> duties trained
> "Ruling partner of thy Empire to be
> valiant prince ordained
> "Eldest son of the eldest brother such
> the maxim we own
> "Worthy of his father's kingdom doth
> ascend his father's throne."

(*Page III Dutt's Ramayana.*)

It seems to me that Rama himself felt the justice of his claim and desired to make amends for the injustice that had been perpetrated. It will be seen from the facts marshalled above, that any amount of white-washing of Sugriva, because he was a partisan of the Aryans, will not clear him of his sin, and that, when Mr. Dutt said.—"Bali was a great king amongst the non-Aryans, but Sugriva thirsted after his kingdom," he stated the truth (vide Ancient Hindu Civilization Vol. 1, p. 141.) Thus the cause espoused by Rama was not a righteous one, and he was impelled to act thus by self-interest.

Now we will examine the conduct of Rama, and see how he comes out of the ordeal. When his shaft struck Vali it did not kill him instantly. Before he breathed his last he had the satisfaction of knowing who the author of his death was and what justification he had in bringing it about. After

Vali was laid prostrate, Rama and Lakshmana approached him, probably with the object of admiring his valour. Addressing them with all respect, he tauntingly enquired, what fame they had secured by secretly compassing his death, and without openly fighting with him in the field, as a serpent does to death a sleeping man, while he had done them no harm knowingly or unknowingly. (Canto 17, Kishkindhakandam.)

In reply Rama advanced two grounds, *viz*:—

1. That the country governed by Vali was subject to the authority of king Baratha as a descendent of Ikshvaku, and he (Rama) as his representative was justified in administering condign punishment to him (Vali) for ravishing the wife of his younger brother Sugriva.

2. That as he (Vali) was an animal, a royal personage such as he was, was justified in hunting him down.

(Canto 18, Kishkindhakanda.)

With regard to the first, I have taken some trouble to prove that the Ikshvaku Empire did not extend to southern India, and that such a condition was impossible in the light of the circumstances existing at the time. On this ground, the authority of king Bharatha could not have been extended to Kishkindha, and much less could Rama have acted as his representative. In the next place even granting that Bharatha exercised suzerainty over Kishkindha, where was the authority on which Rama acted?

(1) As an exile he was a state prisoner, and as such he was debarred from taking part in matters of state. The fact that Rama declined to be present at the coronation of Sugriva, on the ground that he was forbidden by his father to enter any city or country, during the foreteen years of his exile, (Canto 26, Kishkindhakandam) confirms the statement.

(2) If Rama had been in a position to receive a mandate of this kind from the Emperor Bharatha, the first thing he would have done would have been to seek his aid in the recovery of Sitá.

(3) It is curious that a person who was unable to help himself should interfere in state matters.

Lastly, of the two main arguments advanced by Rama, *one cuts the other asunder. For, if Vali could be hunted down as a beast of the field by a royal sportsman, it would be unfair to enforce the standard of morality maintained in human society amongst quadrupeds.*

Vâli—The view taken by my friends and myself, after removing the allegorical veil, is that Vali was a powerful Dravidian king, that when he had to leave his kingdom on an expedition of conquest, he left the reins of Government in the hands of Sugriva, but on his return he found him, surrounded by a number of evil advisers refusing to restore the Government of the country. On this he had to fight his brother, kill some of his followers, and send to exile Sugriva and the rest of them. At the same time he detained the wife of Sugriva as a prize of war and was justified by the code of warfare existing at that time. Here we may cite a modern parallel in the act of the great Napolean after the battle of Austerlitz. After his fall, Valmiki himself has detected in Vali a great and high souled king (*Canto 17, Kishkindhakanda*). His great piety is referred to in canto 39, of the Uttarakanda. He was above all a very generous man. For when he banished Sugriva it was quite in his power to have put him to death. But his fraternal love and his usual kindly nature prevented him from taking that extreme step. (*Canto 24, Kishkindhakanda.*) Again we find that when his favourite queen Tara counselled him against fighting his brother and urged him to live in peace with him, he said that he would once more crush Sugriva's pride and thus teach another lesson, but would not destroy him (*Canto 16, Kishkindhakanda*). To the very last his generous nature would not permit him to think that Rama would be guilty of any iniquity, and that if he did him any harm it would be in fair fight. But such a trait of character appears to be inherent in the family. For, during the war between the Celestials and the Rakshasas, Malyavan had to point out the time-honoured morality of the Kshatrias and

taunt Narayana thus: 'Like a base wight thou slayest us desisting from fight and exercised with fear.' (*Canto 8, Uttarakanda*).

With regard to the observation of Mr. Sadasiva Iyer that Valmiki did not keep back facts unfavourable to the Aryans, I have only to remark that it is always a difficult task to conceal truth. And he has also made much of the counsel of Tara. It will be seen from Canto 15 of the Kishkindhakanda that the following were the points urged by Tara against fighting Sugriva on the second occasion:

(1) That the day was inauspicious;

(2) That Rama was invincible in war and saintly in character;

(3) That it was the duty of the elder brother to protect the younger.

There is therefore nothing about the justness of the cause espoused by Rama, unless the inference is drawn, as I have already demonstrated, that it was otherwise.

Now I shall deal with Vibhishana. The Aryans have translated him to the position of an Alwar or a saint, and counted him amongst the limited members of Siranjeevies or immortals. He is even supposed to rule over Ceylon, of which fact the British Government is not cognizant, and I am not aware that they are paying any tribute to him. It does not appear what virtue Mr. Sadasiva Iyer has detected in him when he states that he fought strenuously on the side of Rama. But a Dravidian certainly finds in him a most ambitious, ungrateful, unbrotherly and disloyal individual. No doubt he counselled against war on the ground of overwhelming strength on the Aryan side. There were, however, others who did the same and yet stood firm by their king, father, brother and lord, and their country. For instance, Kumbhakarna, the mightiest of Ravana's brothers, while agreeing with Vibhishana in denouncing the conduct of Ravana in abducting Sita (as given by the Aryan chronicler), was determined to be "True to brother, and to monarch, be he right, be he wrong"

and "to fight for Lanka." Mr. Dutt speaking of these brothers in his Ramayana makes the following observations:—

"It is noticeable that Ravan's second brother, Kumbhakarna, had the courage to censure his elder's action. But unlike Bibhishan he was determined to fight for his king whether he was right or wrong. There is a touch of sublimity in the devoted loyalty of Kumbhakarna" (*Vide* noted prefix to Book IX of Dutt's Ramayana page 127). Though the Ramayana does not state so, it appears to me that Vibhishana was already in communication with the hostile camp to play his act of treachery for the sake of the coveted crown of Ravana. For, this fact is apparent from the abrupt manner in which Vibhishana deserted Ravana with four of his ministers and went over to the enemy, though considerable efforts have been made by the chronicler to show that he was first suspected as a spy, and that it was only after considerable deliberation he was admitted into the confidence of Rama and his party (*Vide* cantos 17 and 18, Yudhakanda). After he joined Rama, the greatest service Vibhishana rendered was by informing him from time to time of "the secrets by which each warrior could be killed." To enable him to play his part successfully, with the aid of his intimate knowledge of his kinsmen, he watched the movements of every one of them, obtained all useful information, and communicated it to the enemies of his country whenever they stood in need of it. The death of Indrajit for instance—the most tragic of all the incidents in this war—was brought about in this fashion; For, he was known to be invincible, and he would not have been entrapped had he not been taken by surprise at an unguarded moment, by Lakshmana, acting on the information furnished by Vibhishana (*Vide* cantos 85 to 91, Yudhakanda see also canto 35 of the Uttarakanda). Thus the greatest of traitors, whom every Dravidian that has in him a spark of patriotism ought to execrate, has been raised to the status and dignity of an *Alwar.* In our days we have heard of men selling plans of fortifications and ships of naval warfare to the enemies of their country, and how they have been dealt

with when found out. In the Rama-Ravana war, if the tables had only been turned against the Aryans, the fate of Vibhishana could be easily imagined. At its conclusion, there was the usual mock lamentation on the part of this Judas at the fall of Ravana but the fact that he assumed purple without loss of time and without trying to place a direct descendant of Ravana on the throne exhibts him in his true light.

Ravana.—In regard to the character of Ravana I have not much to add to what I have stated in my first article. Mr. Sadasiva Iyer has made out a long list of his disqualifications as a man and a king and of heinous crimes committed by him. But the readers of the Ramayana are familiar with the austere penance he performed for a great length of time accompanied with such self-sacrifice as was unknown to Aryans (Canto 32, Aranyakanda and canto 10, Uttarakanda.) This was at the beginning of his career, but his subsequent life shows that he allowed not a single day to pass without worshipping the Siva-linga with the aid of the choicest flowers and sandal (Canto 36, Uttarakanda). His piety is also exemplified by the innumerable hymns he sang, set to music, in honour of Siva at Kailas (Canto 16, Uttarakanda.) He was also versed in the foreign lore of the Vedas, Angas, and Sastras (Canto 32, Aranyakanda). In addition to music he was also a patron of the other fine arts, as will be seen from the fact that they had attained perfection in his dominions. Certainly the character of the individual who fosters these cannot be depraved. The Ramayana does not speak of any internal troubles in the kingdom though there were expeditions of conquest beyond its confines and all round the known world. But he lived in peace with his brother Dravidian kings such as Vali of Kishkindha and Arjuna of Mâhishmati on the banks of the Narbada (Cantos 37 and 39, Uttarakanda,) and his quarrel appears to have been only with the foreigners. I shall not further tire the reader by enumerating his virtues. In short, the fear of God and other concomitant virtues improve the best side of human nature and are inconsistent with the picture drawn of him by his

enemies. Once upon a time, a tiger and a man met together to witness a painting in which a ferocious tiger was represented as being trampled under the foot of a man. The individual referred to above naturally addressing the beast taunted it pointing out how a fellow tiger was being treated by his brother man. The curt reply the tiger gave was that the picture was drawn by a man. It is necessary to regard the account of Valmiki in the strain of this anecdote. Ravana, therefore, in the light of the statements of the Aryans themselves, was one of the highest and the noblest specimens of humanity and he was misrepresented with an object. My friend Mr. V. P. Subramania Mudaliar observes most ingeniously but truly, that the unnatural possession of the ten heads and twenty arms by Ravana did not literally mean so but only went to show that he had the best qualities of the head and heart, and that foreign jealousy would not permit them to be shown in their true light. It is no wonder therefore, that Sita, who fell into the clutches of Ravana as a prisoner of war, was safe in his hands, notwithstanding the fact that he was over head and ears in love with her. It was quite in his power to violate her chastity, but he would not do anything of the kind against her will and pleasure. It was for this reason he laboured directly and through others to win her affection. Canto 31 of the Uttarakanda threatens a curse against him if ever he dares to violate the modesty of a woman. It seems that this malediction arose out of his unauthorised conduct towards Rambha—the chief of the prostitutes of the dominions of Indra. In the first place, the story is improbable, as she would only have been too glad to secure the love of one who was all-powerful in all the three worlds. In the next place, it was a subterfuge invented by the Aryans to belittle the magnanimity of a great and good man. Lastly, supernaturalism does not find a place in a historical criticism.

There are one or two other points raised by Mr. Sadasiva Iyer respecting the character of Ravana which

should not go unchallenged. He says that he was an undutiful son and an unnatural brother referring to his dealings with Kubera. Both were sons of Visrava, the son of Pulasthya, but by different mothers, one the daughter of Baradwaja and the other of Sumali the Rakshasa. From the birth of time Lanka was the heritage of the Rakshasas, but owing to the insolence offered by them to the celestials, they were driven out of it to the nether world. When Kubera was about to be settled in life, he wanted a place to reside, and, Pulasthya, his grandfather, asked him to occupy the deserted city of Lanka, (Canto 3, Uttarakanda). While he was in possession of it, Ravana attained to man's estate and his maternal grandfather Sumali instigated him to claim it. On this, Kubera consulted their common father Visrava, and he advised him to give it up and retire to the side of Kailas. I do not see any impropriety in claiming one's ancestral estate from an usurper; there is nothing unfilial or unbrotherly in doing so. With regard to the Pushpakavimana belonging to Kubera, he was deprived of it by Ravana in a fair fight. One day the former sent an insulting message to the latter respecting his conduct towards the celestials. He took umbrage at this, fought with him and carried away his Pushpakavimana as a trophy of victory (Canto 15, Uttarakanda).

The abduction of Sita.—Though, in order to meet the arguments of my critic, I have here and there taken for granted the mythological accounts given by Valmiki, to examine this question impartially it is necssary that my readers should shake off the halo of divinity that surrounds certain characters and the allegorical veil thrown over certain portions of the Ramayana. It will then be conceded, in the first place, that Tadaka was connected with the royal family of Lanka at least as a member of the Rakshasa race, if she was not even more closely allied, and her death therefore by the hand of Rama must have been working in the minds of all prominent Rakshasas, as she was herself a leading member of the community, having been the powerful queen of a province of India. In the next place, Surpanaka was a princess

holding a high status at Dandakaranya and Janasthana. She was married to the king of Danavas, but in a war that ensued between those people and Ravana, he was killed by Ravana himself (Canto 23, Uttarakanda). On the complaint of his widowed sister, she was appointed as the Vicerene of the two provinces named above. Kara was nominated as her Prime Minister to carry out her behests and Dushana was deputed at the head of 14,000 men to guard her and her kingdom (*Vide* Canto 29, Uttarakanda.) When there exist chapter and verse for the statement made by me in the very authority on which Mr. Sadasiva Iyer relied, I cannot conceive how he could convict us of misquotations and claim that the provinces formed a part of the kingdom of the Ikshvakus. But this is a digression. To resume the thread of the account, Ravana must have felt the mutilation of the features of his unfortunate sister as an insult added to injury. To add to these, the kingdom was laid waste and the garrison of 14,000 picked men was annihilated. Further the enemies of his (Ravana's) country, who were under a ban not to enter it, were encouraged to cross the borders and settle themselves down with impunity. These series of events are sufficient as a *casus beli*, and Ravana was therefore justified in retaliating upon Rama by carrying away Sita. As I have already stated, conditions of war both in ancient and modern times permitted such a course. To say that the all-powerful Ravana went like a thief, when there was no necessity for such a course, and that Surpanaka rushed upon Sita at an unguarded moment in order to eat her up are unlikely and incredible stories. When Ravana knew that the flower of his army was destroyed, he would have gone to the scene of the battle with a large re-inforcement and not single-handed. In all probability Rama and Lakshmana were discomfited before Sita was captured, and, in order to screen a great disgrace, fanciful stories were concocted. In the same way the royal princess who was ruling over Dandakaranya and Janasthana could not have gone to snatch away Sita unattended. It is likely that she was in love with Rama and, impelled by this, she paid a clandestine visit to him, and being detected by Sita, Lakshmana treated her in the

manner described above at her instance. It may be that Rama passed over the matter as a freak on the part of an idiotic craven crone, but the manner in which this refined torture was perpetrated on the person of a woman, shows that the idea could only have emanated from another woman impelled by feelings of fiendish revenge. But whoever may have been their author, such acts of barbarity did not become any polished man, much less Rama, who had put on the garb of the universal avenger of wrongs.

In my first paper, I had raised a number of questions which call for historical criticism, but Mr. Sadasiva Iyer has thought fit to dismiss them with the simple statement that he was not going to criticise the logic and conclusions arrived at by me as I have already stated. I have referred to the existence of Rakshasas, Asuras, Devas and Vanaras. It requires no long arguments to prove that, in God's kingdom, there was no catylysm of this kind. Everything has always been in its normal condition, and if there was anything unnatural, it was the mind of man that brought about that aberration incited by malice and envy. . We will take for instance the Rakshasas and see if such beings as described by Valmiki were ever created. If my readers would take the trouble of referring to canto 4 of the Uttarakanda of the Ramayana, they would find that in the beginning God created water, and then men to guard it. When he assigned this duty they said *rakshânâm*, "we will protect." Thus even according to the mythological accounts of the Aryans, Rakshasa was a man and he was created to be the guardian of property. In Southern India there is a class of stalwart dark complexioned people called Marravas, meaning heroes, breathing martial spirit in them and always in search of adventures, and of whom every Dravidian has reasons to feel proud (notwithstanding the bad habits into which some of them have fallen of late). I think it was to them that the early Aryans have referred as Rakshasas. They were either aboriginal inhabitants of the place or the earliest settlers. They not only formed the fighting strength of the early

sovereigns, but were also engaged in policing the country in peaceful times, besides being rulers of provinces. From a certain noble duty they had to perform, and that during nights, the Aryans chose to nickname them and add a reproach to it. All this, as well as the assigning of superhuman strength to them, was meant to enhance the reputation of the Aryans. For, if it can be said that an ordinary mortal killed in a fair fight a giant of the status of Virathan, who moved about like a fleeting mountain, carrying in his train all kinds of monsters and being decked with garlands of elephants, lions and other animals of the wood without number, strung together by means of serpents of immense size (Canto 4, Aranyakanda) the credit is all his. In the same way, if it is represented that Rama, a child in his teens, fought Tadaka of the description given in canto 25 of the Balakanda, and that he killed Ravana of twenty arms, his reputation must spread throughout the world *vide* also Sabhaparva—Mahabaratha. In the same way, the origin of Asuras and Vanaras who belonged to a prior wave of emigration may be traced as I have already stated, the Devas and Rishis were only sections of the Aryans who were introduced into the Dravida land. Mr. Sadasiva Iyer omitted to refer to this subject or ignored it, so that an unpleasant truth might not be laid bare before that portion of the public who are held in a spell of ignorance.

In conclusion, I regret that this paper has run out to this inordinate length against my expectations. In performing a duty to the public, for I regard it as such, if I have exceeded the limits of an ordinary magazine article, I have only to crave the indulgence of my readers, and, in atonement of my sin, I make the following summary.

1. That my paper on the Ramayana was a historical criticism and it did not deal with any faith or attack of any class.

2. That the intemperate language in which Mr. Sadasiva Iyer's review is couched and the introduction of politics into the discussion were uncalled for—particularly in the present unfortunate condition of India.

3. That the Dravidians belonged to a wave of emigration earlier than that of Aryans and they had a civilization distinctly their own.

4. That there is certainly Aryan blood in the Dravidians while Dravidian blood runs free in the veins of Aryans.

5. That the caste system in Southern India was of later introduction than in the north.

6. That the want of faith in the Ramayana on the part of the late professor Sundaram Pillai continued to the day of his death.

7. That the Ikshvakus never exercised imperial authority over the whole India, much less over Dandakaranya and Janasthana which were under the absolute control of Ravana. There is internal evidence in the Ramayana besides extraneous circumstances to prove this fact.

8. That Tadaka was of the same race as Ravana even if she did not stand in the relationship of a grandmother to him.

9. That in espousing the cause of Sugriva, Rama did not espouse a right cause. Vali was a more virtuous person than his brother.

10. That both the reasons advanced by Rama for killing Vali from his place of concealment are untenable.

11. That Vibhishana was the greatest traitor to his country, besides being disloyal and unbrotherly.

12. That, Ravana and his tribe of Rakshasas belonged to the human race and, in all probability, to the Marava community of the present day, thus forming a section of the Dravidians; and (Ravana) was the highest and the noblest specimen of humanity of his time.

13. That the so-called abduction of Sita, was only her capture as a prisoner of war and the act of Ravana is justified both by ancient and modern laws of warfare.

KUTTALAM,
28th January, 1910.

T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI.

Sri Valmiki and South India.

ஸ்ரீவான்மீகரும் தென்னாடும்.

BY

M. R. Ry. M. Raghava Aiyengar, Avl.

"வாங்கரும் பாத நான்கும் வகுத்தவான் மீகி யென்பான்
தீங்கவி செவிக ளாரத் தேவரும் பருகச் செய்தான்"

என்று மகாகவிகள் புகழும் ஸ்ரீவால்மீகி முனிவர் தம்காலத்தில் விளங்கிய பரதகண்ட நிலையைத் தம் ஆதிகாவியத்தில் உரிய விடங்களிலெல்லாம் சூசிப்பித்தருளுவர். அம்முறைப்படி, தென்னாடும் அவர் வாக்கில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுளது. வான்மீகி முனி கூறிய தென்னாடென்பது விந்திய மலையின் தென்பக்க முழுமையுமாம். கிஷ்கிந்தையில்,* சுக்கிரீவ மகாராஜன், பிராட்டியைத் தேடி வரும்படி வானர வீரர்களை ஏவும் போது, தென்பக்கமாகச் செல்லுதற்குரியாரை நோக்கிச் சொல்லியதாக வால்மீகிமுனிவர் கூறியவை அடியில் வருமாறு:—

"அப்பெரிய வானர சேனையை அனுப்பிவிட்டுக், குறிக்கப்பட்ட வானரர் சிலரைத் தென்றிசைக் கேவுவா னாயினன்........பின்பு அவன் தென்றிசையில் போதற் கரிதா யிருக்கு மென்பதைப் பற்றி அவர்களை நோக்கிச் சொல்லத் தொடங்கி—"பலவித மரங்களும் கொடிகளுஞ் செறிந்த ஆயிரஞ் சிகரங்களை யுடைய விந்த மலையையும், பெரும் பாம்புகள் தங்குவதும் கடத்தற் கரியது மாகிய நருமதாநதியையும், பெரும் பகுதிகளை யுடைய வரதாநதியையும், மேகலை உத்கலை தசார்ண முதலிய நாடுகளையும், அசுவவந்தி அவந்தி முதலிய நகரங்களையும் நீங்கள் காண்பீர்கள்; விதர்ப்பம் ருஷிகம் மாகிஷகம் வங்கம் கலிங்கம் கௌசிகம், மலைகளும் நதிகளும்

---

* கிஷ்கிந்தை என்பது, துங்கபத்திரா நதிக்குச் சமீபமானதும் பம்பா சரஸ் இருந்த இடமுமாகிய ஹம்பி (Humpi) நகரை அடுத்து, மதங்காசிரமத்தைப் பெற்றிருந்த தாகிய ரிசியமூக பர்வதம், "மான்மலை," என்பதன் தென்பாலும், நீலகிரி, குடகு மலைத்தொடர்களுக்கு வடபாலு மாக, மைசூர் மலைப்பிரதேசங்களை யுள்ளடக்கிய "மேற்குத் தொடர்ச்சி மலை" யாம்.

குகைகளு முடைய தண்டகாரணியம், கோதாவரிநதி முதலியவற்றையும் காண்பீர்கள்; அவ்வாறே, ஆந்திரம் புண்டரம் சோளம் கேரளத்தோடு கூடிய பாண்டிய நாடுகளையும் காண்பீர்; பின்பு, தாதுக்கள் நிறைந்ததும் விசித்திரமான சிகரங்க ளுடையதும் பலவர்ணமான பூக்கள் நிறைந்த சோலைகளை யுடையதும் சந்தனவனங்கள் செறிந்தது மான பெரிய அயோமுக மலையைத்*தேடுங்கள்; அதன்பின் தேவ ரம்பையர் வந்து நீராடுகின்ற திவ்யமான தெளிந்த நீரையுடைய அழகிய காவேரி நதியை அங்கே காண்பீர்கள்; அந்த மலைய மலையின் சிகரத்திலே ஆதித்தனுக்குச் சமானமான மிகுந்த ஒளியை யுடைய முனி சிரேஷ்டரான அகஸ்தியரைக் காண்பீர்கள். பின் அம்மகருஷி யிடத்தில் ஆணைபெற்றுச் சென்று முதலைகள் நிரம்பிய பெரிய தாமிரபர்ணி நதியைத் தாண்டுங்கள். அந்நதி அழகிய சந்தனச்சோலைகளால் மூடப்பெற்ற திட்டுக்களை யுடையதாய், கணவனிடத் தன்புள்ள யுவதியானவள் புக்ககம் புகுமாறுபோல, சமுத்திரத்திற் சென்று விழும். பிறகு பொன்னிறைந்ததாயும் அழகுடைத்தாயும், முத்தமயமான மணிகளால் அலங்கரிக்கப் பெற்றதாயும், பாண்டியர்க்கு யோக்கியமாயு முள்ள கவாடத்தையும் பார்க்கக் கடவீர்கள்; அதன்பின் சமுத்திரத்தை யடைந்து காரிய நிச்சயத்தைச் செய்யுங்கள்."

வான்மீக பகவானது இவ்வாக்கியங்களில், விந்திய பர்வதத்துக்குத் தென்பக்கத்தே—நருமதை, கிருஷ்ணவேணி, கோதாவரி, காவிரி, தாமிரபர்ணி முதலிய நதிகளும், மேகலதேசம் (விந்தப்ரதேசம்), உத்கல தேசம் (கஞ்சம்), தசார்ணம் (சண்டர கிரியின் கிழக்கு), அசுவவந்தி, விதர்ப்பம் (பீரார்), ருஷிகதேசம் (பங்காளப்பகுதி), மாகிஷகதேசம்†, கலிங்கம் (வடசர்க்கார்), கௌசிகம், ஆந்திரம் (தெலுங்காணம்), புண்டரம் (வங்கதேசப் பகுதி), சேர சோழ பாண்டியம் முதலிய நாடுகளும், தண்டகாரணியம் என்ற பெரிய வனமும் குறிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளன. சுக்கிரீவன் வானர வீரர்களைத் தென்றிசைக்குச் செல்லும்படி விடுக்குமிடத்து, இந்நாடு முதலியவை வருதலால், இவை ஆரிய மக்களால் தக்ஷிணப் பிரிவுகளாக முன்பு கருதப்பட்டிருந்தனவென்பது விளங்கும்.

இவற்றுள் தண்டகாரணியத்தினைப் பற்றிய வரலாறுகள் சில வான்மீகத்தினின்று அதிகமாக அறியப்படுகின்றன. இவற்றை,

---

* இது மலையமலையைக் குறிக்கும். [அயோமுகம், "ஆட்டுத்தலை"; வில்வலன் வாதாபி கதைகளைச் சார்ந்து குடகு மலைக்கு வந்த பெயர். மலயமலை-குடகுமலை. Ed.]

† இது விந்தப்பிரதேசத்தைச் சார்ந்த அநூபதேசத்தின் தலைநகர் என்று இரகுவம்சத்து, ௬-ம்சர்க்கம், ௩௭, ௪௩-ம்சுலோகங்களால் விளங்கும்.

யாழ்ப்பாணத்து ஸ்ரீமான்-முத்துத்தம்பிப்பிள்ளையவர்கள் "தமிழ் நாட்டின் பூர்வநிலை"* என்ற வியாஸத்துக் குறித்திருக்கின்றனர். அவ்வரலாறு வருமாறு.† "பகவான் அகஸ்திய முனிவர் ஸ்ரீராமனை நோக்கி, இத்தேசத்தினது வரலாற்றை உள்ளவாறு கூறுவேன் கேட்பாயாக. பார்க்கவ மகரிஷியினது சாபத்தால் தண்டகனு மழிந்து, அவன் தேசமாகிய இதுவும் மக்களும் விலங்குகளும் வாழப் பெறாத தாயிற்று. விருக்ஷம் செடி கொடிகள் தவமுனிவர்கள் இல்லாததும், மிக்க பயங்கரமும் சகித்தற் கரிய வெம்மையு முடையது மாகிய பாலை நில மாயிற்று. விந்திய கிரியினது அடிவார முதல் தெற்கே ஆயிரம் யோஜனை தூரம் வரையும் மழை வீழ்தலும் சுகமான காற்று வீசுதலும் இல்லை. மிக்க பயங்கர முடையதும் கொடியதும் கனற்புகை சூழ்ந்தது மாகிய காடாய்ப் பல்லாயிரம் வருஷம் நிர்மானுஷ்யமாய்க் கிடந்தது. பின்னர் வெள்ளி மயமாகிய இமயத்தினின்றும் இங்கு வந்தேன். பர்ஜன்னியமென்னும் ஜலதேவதையோடு மேகங்களைக் கொணர்ந்தேன். இமயத்திலிருந்து நானாவகை ஓஷதிகளும் கொணர்ந்து வளர்க்கப்பட்டன. மீண்டும் அழகிய தாமரை யோடைகளும் நதிகளும் குளங்களும் அமைக்கப்பட்டன. அவற்றால் செழித்தடர்ந்த திவ்ய வனங்களும் பலவகைத் தானியங்கள் விளைகின்ற விளையுள்களும் உண்டாயின. வனங்களெங்கும் இருடிகள் குடிகொண்டார்கள். மனதிற்குக் களிப்பைத் தருகின்ற காட்சியினையுடைய தேச மாயிற்று" என்க.

இச்செய்திகளால், இராமாயண சரித்திரம் நடந்தேறுதற்கு முன்னர், தண்டகாரணியத்துக்கு அகஸ்திய மகருஷி வந்தாரென்பதும், அவர் வருகைக்கு முன்பு இக்காடு வெறும் பாழ் வனமாயும் சிலவிடத்து அடர்ந்த பெருங்காடாயு மிருந்த தென்பதும், அம்முனிவர் இங்கு வரும்போது அநேக ருஷிகளையும் அழைத்து வந்தா ரென்பதும், அக்குறுமுனிவரே இத்தேசத்

---

* செந்தமிழ்த் தொகுதி - க; பக் - ௩௦௬.

† இப்பகுதி—ஆரணியகாண்டத்துப் பதின்மூன்றும் அத்தியாயத்துக் கண்டதென்று—ஷை பிள்ளையவர்கள் குறித்திருத்தலோடு, "மூதற்குறளுண்மை" என்னுந் தலைப்பெயருடன் 1900-ஷ மதுராஸ் ரிப்பன் அச்சியந்திரசாலையினின்று வெளிவந்த புஸ்தகத்தும் விவரிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. இப்பகுதி அச்சுப்பிரதிகளிற் காணப்படவில்லையென்றும், சில வான்மீகக் கையெழுத்துப் பிரதிகளிற் கண்டதென்றுந் தெரியவருகிறது.

தில் நல்லமழை நல்லநதி நன்மரங்கள் முதலியவற்றை உண்டாக்கினரென்பதும் புலப்படும்.

அகத்தியனார் தெற்கே வருவதற்கு முன், இக்ஷ்வாகு மைந்தனாகிய தண்டகன் சுக்கிர சாபத்தினால் மண்மாரி பெய்ய மடிந்தகாலத்து அவன் ராஜ்யமும் மடிந்த தென்பது இராமாயணம் உத்தரகாண்டத்துக் கண்டது. இக்ஷ்வாகுவின் மைந்தனான தண்டகன் கொடியோனாய் விந்தத்துக்கும் சைவலத்துக்கும் இடைப்பட்ட நாட்டை ஆட்சிசெய்து வருகையில், பார்க்கவ (சுக்கிரன்) புத்திரியாகிய அரசை யென்பாளைக் காதலித்து அவளை வலிதிற் கலந்த காரணத்தால் அங்ஙனம் சுக்ரசாபம் பெற்றனன் என்பது கதை.

தண்டகாரண்ய மென்பது, முற்காலத்தில், சேர சோழ பாண்டிய நாடுகளை அடுத்திருந்த தென்பது, அந்நாடுகட்கும் விந்தத்துக்கு மிடையில் வேறு தேசங்களைக் குறியாது,*· 'விந்தத்தின் தெற்கே ஆயிரம் யோசனை யளவும் வெறுங் காடாய்க் கிடந்தது" என வான்மீகி கூறுதலால் விளங்கும். ஸ்ரீராம பிரான் காலத்தில், அப்பெருவனாந்தரத்தில் அங்கங்கே ருஷிகள் அநேகர் குடியேறி வசித்து வந்தன ரென்பதும், அப்பிரதேசம் ஜனஸ்தானம் எனப் பெயர் பெற்றதென்பதும் மேற்காட்டிய பிரமாணங்களே விளக்கும். "ஜனஸ்தானத்தில் போருண்டாகு மென்று சந்தேகித்தவனும் இலங்கைக் கரசனுமாகிய இராவணன், ஈசுவரனிட மிருந்து அடைதற் கரிய பிரமசிர மென்ற அஸ்திரத்தைப் பாண்டியன் பெற்றிருப்பது தெரிந்து, அம்மன்னனுடன் சந்தி செய்துகொண்டு இந்திரலோகத்தை வெல்லப் போனான்"† எனக் காளிதாசர் ரகுவமிசத்திற் கூறுவதால், அந்த ஜனஸ்தானமும் தமிழ்நாட்டுக்கு வெகுதூர மன்றென்பது பெறப்படும். இத்தண்டகாரண்யம், ஆரியமக்களால் மிகுதி

* சேரசோழ பாண்டியதேசங்கள் நீங்க, மேலே கூறிய நாடுகளெல்லாம் விந்தியத்தையொட்டியும் அதனைச்சிறிது அடுத்து முள்ளவைகளே யாதலாலும், விந்தத்துக்குந் தென்னாட்டுக்கும் மத்தியில் வேறுதேசங் குறிக்கப்படாமையாலும், வால்மீகி காலத்து அவ்விடம் பெருவனாந்தரமே யென்பது நன்கு தெளியப்படும். பாரதத்தில், தெற்கே அநேக ராஜ்யங்கள் குறிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளன. (See Bhandarkar's History of Dekkan. p. 142.)

† இரகுவமிசம், சர்க்-சு; சுலோ—சுஅ.

யுங் குடியேறப் பெற்ற பிற்காலத்திலும், அவ்வனத்தின் ஆதிப் பெயரே தன்பெயராய்த் தண்டகாரண்ய நாடென்னும் பெயர் பெறலாயிற்று. "பதிற்றுப்பத்"தின் ஆறுவதன் பதிகத்தில், ஆடு கோட்பாட்டுச் சேரலாதன் செய்கைகளுள், "தண்டாரணியத் துக் கோட்பட்ட வருடையைத், தொண்டியுட் டந்து கொடுப் பித்து" எனவும், அதனுரையில் "தண்டாரணிய மென்றது ஆரிய நாட்டி னுள்ளதோர் நாடு"* எனவும் வருதலால், தமிழ் நாட்டை யடுத்து அஃதிருந்ததும் பிறவும் உணர்க.

இத்தண்டகாரணியத்துக்குப் பின், வான்மீகி முனிவர், ஆந் திர புண்டர சோழ கேரள பாண்டிய நாடுகளைக் குறித்துவிட்டு, பின்னர், மலயபருவதத்தின் சிறப்பையும் அம்மலையினின்று காவிரிநதி பிரவகித்தலையும் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளார். மலய பர்வதம் என்பது, தென் கோடியிலுள்ள பொதியமலை மட்டுமன்றி, நீலகிரியும் குடகும் அடங்கிய "மேற்குத் தொடர்ச்சி மலை" ப்ரதேசமு மாம். அம்மலையினின்று தெய்வத்தன்மை வாய்ந்த காவிரி வெளியாவதையும் அம்மலையி னுச்சியில் அகஸ்தியமுனி வர் விளங்குவதையும் வான்மீகியார் கூறியுள்ளார். அகஸ்தியர் காவிரி யுற்பத்தி யாகு மிடத்தில் வசிப்பதாக முனிவர் இங்கே கூறினும், ஆரணியகாண்டத்தில், கோதாவரிக் கரையிலுள்ள பஞ்சவடிக்கு (Nasik) இரண்டு யோசனை தூரத்தில் அகஸ்தியா சிரம மிருந்த தாகவும் அவர் கூறி யிருக்கின்றார். இதனால், அக்குறு முனிவர், "மேற்குத்தொடர்ச்சி மலை" முழுமைக்கும் உரியவராய்த் தென்னாட்டைக் காத்தருளியவர் என்பது விளங்கும். இனி வானர வீரர்களை நோக்கி சுக்ரீவன் வழி கூறும் போது, "அம் மலயமலையி னுச்சியில் மிகவும் தேஜோ வானாய் சூரியஸமானராய் ருஷிசிரேஷ்டராய் உள்ள அகஸ்திய முனிவரையும் பாருங்கள்; பிறகு, நிர்மலசித்தமும் மிகவும் ஞானவானுமான அம்முனிவரது ஆணைபெற்றுக்கொண்டு தாமிர பர்ணியைத் தாண்டுங்கள்" எனக்குறித்தலான், தென்னாட்டிற் புகுவதற்கு அகஸ்திய முனிவரது அநுமதி பெறுதல் அக்காலத்

* மகாராஷ்டிர தேசத்துப் பிராமணர், விசேடகாலங்களிற் செய்யும் வடமொழி ஸங்கல்பக் கட்டுரையில் "மகாராஷ்டிர தேசே" என்னாது, "தண்டகாரண்ய தேசே" எனக் கூறிவருதல் இன்றும் வழக்கமென்று தெரிதலால், அம்மகாராஷ்டிர தேசமே இவ்வாரிய நாடாகக் கருதத் தக்கது. (See Bhandarkar's History of Dekkan, p. 136.)

தில் அநுகூலமா யிருந்த தென்பதும் விளங்கும். இதனை நோக்கும் போது, குறுமுனிவர் "இராவணனைக் கந்தருவத்தாற் பிணித்து அவனை ஆண்டு (தென்னாட்டுள்) வாராமை விலக்கிப் பொதியின்கண் இருந்தனர்" என்ற நச்சினார்க்கினியர் கூற்று ஞாபகத்துக்கு வருகிறது. அக்காலத்து அரக்கராதியரால் தென்னாட்டு ஆரியர்க்கு நேரும் இடுக்கண் நீக்கி அநுகூலஞ் செய்தற்கு அகத்தியரே முன்னின்றுபகரித்தாராவ ரென்பதற்கு வடமொழி தென்மொழிப் பிரமாணங்கள் பல காட்டலாம். வான்மீகி பகவான், ஸ்ரீராமபிரான் லக்ஷ்மணரை நோக்கி அகஸ்தியாசிரமத்தைப் பற்றிக் கூறியதைக் குறிக்கும் போது, "அம்மகானாகிய அகஸ்தியர், தாம் இவ்வுலகத்துக்கு நன்மை செய்யும் பொருட்டு, இங்கிருந்த யமனுடைய உபத்திரவத்தை நீக்கி, இத்தென்றிசையையும் சுகமாக வசிக்கத் தக்க திசையாகத் தமது தவவலிமையாற் செய்து வைத்தார்" எனவும், "எவரொருவருடைய மகிமையால், இன்றைக்கும் அசுரர்கள் இத்தென்றிசையைக் கண்ணெடுத்துப்பார்த்து உட்புக நடுங்குகின்றார்களோ, அவருடைய ஆசிரமம் அது; மகா புண்ணிய மூர்த்தியாகிய அவர் இத்திசைக்கு வந்தது முதல், இங்கே அரக்கர்கள் தம் பகைமை நீங்கிச் சாந்த முள்ளவராய் விட்டார்கள். அவர் பெயரைக் கொண்டே இத்தென்றிசையும் அகஸ்தியர்திசை என்று வெகு சாந்தமான பெயர் பெற்று மூவுலகத்தும் பிரசித்தி யடைந்து கொடியவர் அஞ்சும் திசையாக விளங்குகிறது" எனவும் ஆரணியகாண்டத்து கக-ம் சருக்கத்துக் கூறுதலால் மேற்கூறிய விஷயம் நன்கு வெளியாகும்.

இனி, தமிழ் வரலாறுகளை நோக்கு மிடத்து, முற்காலத்தே அசுரர்களால் துன்ப நேர்ந்த போது சோழ னொருவன் "தூங்கெயிலெறிந்"தது, இக்குறுமுனிவர் அருளினாலே, ஆம் என்பது விளங்கும். இதனை,

"உலகந் திரியா வோங்குயர் விழுச்சீர்ப்
பலர்புகழ் மூதூர்ப் பண்புமேம் படீஇய
ஓங்குயர் மலயத் தருந்தவ னுரைப்பத்
தூங்கெயி லெறிந்த தொடித்தோட் செம்பியன்"

என்னும் மணிமேகலை யடிகளிற் (காதை-க.) காண்க. காந்தமன் என்னும் மற்றொரு சோழன் பரசுராமரது கொடுமையினின்று

தப்ப இம்முனிவரது பேரருளை நாடிய வரலாறு "அமர முனிவ னகத்தியன் றனாது, துயர்நீங்கு கிளவியின் யான்றோன் றளவுங் ககந்தன் காத்தல்" என அந்நூலானே (௨௨ சிறைசெய் காதை; அடி,—௩௫-௩௭) அறியலாம். இக்காந்த மன்னவன் பொருட்டே, காவிரியைச் சோணாட்டிற் பிரவகிக்கும்படி அவ் வகத்தியனார் செய்தா ரென்பது,

"செங்கதிர்ச் செல்வன் திருக்குலம் விளக்கும்
கஞ்ச வேட்கையிற் காந்தமன் வேண்ட
அமர முனிவன் அகத்தியன் றனாது
கரகங் கவிழ்த்த காவிரிப் பாவை
செங்குணக் கொழுகிய சம்பாபதி"

எனவரும் அந்நூற்பதிகத்தால் அறிக. (சம்பாபதி என்பது காவிரிப் பூம்பட்டினம்.) இதனுள், "அமர முனிவனகத்தியன் றனாது, கரகங் கவிழ்த்த காவிரி" என்பதனால், அகஸ்தியாசிரம மொன்று, குடகுமலையில் இருந்தமை வலிபெறும்.* இவ்வாறே, பாண்டியனுக்கும் அகத்தியனார் மிகவும் அருள்செய்தவ ரென்பது, "அகஸ்தியரால் பட்டாபிஷேகம் செய்யப்பட்ட பாண்டிய வமிசம்," "பாண்டிய வமிசத்துக்கு ஆதியில் ஆசாரியஸ்தானம் வகித்தவர் அகஸ்தியர்" என நூல்களிலும் சாஸனங்களிலும் காணப்படுவதால் அறியலாம். "ஸ்ரீகாளிதாஸரும் "அகஸ்திய மாமுனிவர், இப்பாண்டியர் தமது அசுவமேத யாகத்தை

* [அகஸ்தியர், தெற்கின் கண்ணுள்ள "பொதியில்" (பொதியை) மலையை யடைந்து அங்கு நிலை பெறுமுன்னர், முதற்கண் இருந்தது காவிரியின் பிறப்பிடமாகிய குடகுமலையாம். அம்மலைப் பிரதேசம் பூர்வம் வில்வலன் வாதாபி என்ற அசுரர்க்கு உரியது; அவரைக்கொன்று அகஸ்தியர் அதனைக் கைக்கொண்டனர். இதற்குப் பதின்மூன்று வருடங்களுக்கு முன்னர்ச் சிலகாலம் அவர் கோதாவரி தீரத்திலும் குடியிருந்ததாக இராமாயணத்தால் அறிகிறோம். இராமாயண காலத்தின் பின்னரே அகஸ்தியர் தெற்கேகிப் பாண்டியர் அநுசரணை பெற்றுப் பொதியிற்கண் வாழ்ந்தன ராதல் வேண்டும். குடகும் பொதியிலும் அகஸ்தியர்க்கு இருப்பிடமான காரணத்தால் இவ்விரண்டற்கும் "மலயம்" என்ற பெயர் வடநூல் வழக்காயிற்று. இவர் குடகினின்றும் தெற்குப் போந்தா ராதலின் இவர்க்குக் "குடமுனி" என்ற பெயரு முண்டு. இப்பெயர்க்காரணம் அறியமாட்டாதார் "குடமுனி" என்பதற்கு "கும்பஜன்" என்று பொருள் கண்டு, அதற்கேற்பப் பொருந்தாக் கதைகளையும் தம் நூல்களுள் எழுதிப் புகுத்தனர். அம்முனிவர்க்கு "குறுமுனி" என்ற பெயர் "குறுக்கு" (Kurukh) மொழி சம்பந்தமாய் வந்த பெயர் போலும். "குறுக்கு"—குடநாட்டார் மொழி. Ed.]

முடித்து அவபிருத ஸ்நானஞ் செய்தவுடன், வெகு அன்போடும் இம்மன்னரிடம் வந்து 'தங்களுடைய ஸ்நாநம் சரிவர முடிந்ததா?' என்று கேட்கிறார்'' என்று இரகுவமிசத்துக் (சருக்-கூ; சுலோ-கூக) கூறுதல், அகஸ்தியர் பாண்டியர்க்குள்ள நெருங்கிய தொடர்பை விளக்கும்.

மேற்கூறிய அகத்திய முனிவர் வரலாறுகளை யெல்லாம் கூட்டிப் பார்க்குமிடத்து, அம்முனிவர் மேற்கொண்ட முயற்சி முழுதும், முக்கியமாக, ஜனப் பெருக்க மின்றிப் பெருங்காடாய்க்கிடந்த விந்தத்தின் தென்பகுதியில் ஆரியமக்களைக் குடியேற்றி, அப்பகுதியை நிலவளம் நீர்வள முடையதாக்கி, அன்னோர்க்கு வேண்டிய சௌகரியஞ் செய்து விருத்தி செய்ததே என்பது நன்குவிளங்கும். பூமியின் வடபாகம் ஜனநெருக்கத்தின் மிகுதியால் தாழ்ந்தும் தென்பாகம் அஃதின்றி உயர்ந்தும் இருந்தவற்றைச் சமநிலைப்படுத்தவேண்டித் தேவர்களால் அகத்தியர் தென்றிசைக்கு அனுப்பப்பட்டார் என்று புராணங்கள் கூறுவதில் உண்மையுளதேல், அது தென்பகுதியில் அம்முனிவர் மேற்கொண்ட குடியேற்ற முயற்சியே யன்றிப் பிறிதன்றாம். இதற்கேற்ப, தென்றிசைக்குப் போதுகின்ற அகத்தியர், "துவராபதிப் போந்து நிலங்கடந்த நெடுமுடி யண்ணல் வழிக்கண், பதினெண்குடி வேளிருள்ளிட்டாரையும் அருவாளரையும் கொடு போந்து காடுகெடுத்து நாடாக்கி" ச்செழிக்க வைத்தார் எனத் தொல்காப்பியப் பாயிர வுரையில் நச்சினார்க்கினியர் குறித்த பழைய செய்தியும் பொருந்துமாறு கண்டு கொள்க.

இனி, விந்தியத்தின் தென்பாலுள்ள நாடுகளைக் குறித்து வந்த வான்மீகிமுனிவர், "சோளாந் பாண்டியாந் ஸகேரளாந்"— (சோழதேசத்தையும் கேரளத் தோடுகூடிய பாண்டியதேசத்தையும்) என்று கூறுகிறார். "ஒருவினை யொடுச்சொல் லுயர்பின் வழித்தே'' என்னுந் தமிழ் வழக்குப்படி, 'கேரளத் தோடுகூடிய பாண்டியம்' என்பது கேரளதேசம் உயர்ந்ததென்பதைக் குறிக்குமாயினும், வடமொழி வழக்கு இதற்கு நேரெதிராகும்; என்னை? "ஸஹயுக்தே அப்பிரதானே" என்பது அதனிலக்கணமாதலின். அஃதாவது "ஒருவினை யொடுச்சொல் இழிபின் வழித்தே" என்பதாம். இங்ஙனம் 'பாண்டியாந் ஸகேரளாந்'

என அப்பிரதானத்தில் கேரளத்துக்கு 'ஓடு' கொடுத்திருத்தலால் வான்மீகி காலத்துப் பாண்டிய நாட்டுக்குள்ளடங்கிச் சேரநாடு இருந்தது போலும்!

இனி, மலயத்தி லுள்ள அகத்திய முனிவர்பால் விடைபெற்ற பின்னர், தாமிரபர்ணி நதியைத் தாண்டும்படி கூறப்படுதலோடு, அந்நதி சமுத்திரத்துச் செல்லுமாறுஞ் சொல்லப்படுகிறது.* அதன் பின்பு பாண்டியனது நகர விசேடம் வருகின்றது. இங்ஙனம், அந்நதி சமுத்திரஞ் சார்தலைக் கூறிப் பாண்டியன் நகரவிசேடத்தை வான்மீகி குறித்தலால், அப்பட்டணம் தாமிரபர்ணியின் சங்கமத் தயலில் இருந்ததாகக் கருதத்தக்கது. "அதன்பின் சமுத்திரத்தை யடைந்து காரிய நிச்சயத்தைச் செய்யுங்கள்" என முடிவில் மகருஷி கூறுதலாலும் இதுவே கருத்தாதல் காணலாம். இனி, இப்பாண்டியனது நகரவிசேடத்தைப்பற்றி வால்மீகி கூறும் சுலோகம் வருமாறு:—

ததோ ஹேமமயம் திவ்யம் முக்தாமணி விபூஷிதம் ।
யுக்தம் கவாடம் பாண்ட்யாநாம் கதா த்ரக்ஷ்யத வாநரா: ॥

இதன்பொருள்:—"பிறகு, பொன்நிறைந்ததாயும் அழகுடைத்தாயும், முத்துமயமான மணிகளால் அலங்கரிக்கப்பட்டதாயும், பாண்டியர்க்கு யோக்யமானதாயு முள்ள கவாடத்தை வானர வீரர்காள்! பார்க்கக் கடவீர்" என்பது. இவ்வுரை, திலகர் தீர்த்தர் கோவிந்தராஜர் என்னும் இராமாயண வியாக்யாதாக்களுள் பின்னவர் கூறியது. முன்னவ ரிருவரும் "பின்பு பொன்னிறைந்ததாயும், அழகுடைத்தாயும், முத்துமணி யிவற்றால் அணியப்பட்டதாயும் நகரத்தரணோடு இணைக்கப்பட்டதாயு முள்ள பாண்டியர் வாயிற்கதவை வானரர்காள்! போய்க் காண்பீர்" என்னும் பொருள்படக் கூறினர். அஃதாவது—"கவாடம்-பாண்ட்யாநாம் நகர த்வார கபாடம்", பாண்டியரது நகரவாயிற் கதவு, என்பது தீர்த்தீயம்; "யுக்தம் புரப்ராகார கடிதம்", நகரத்தெயிலோடு இணைக்கப்பட்ட, என்பது திலகம். இங்ஙனம், வடநாட்டாராய் விளங்கிய உரையாசிரியர் கருத்திவை யாயினும், தென்னாட்டாராய் வான்மீகத்துக் குரையிட்ட

* தென்பால், வையை முதலிய நதிகளை முனிவர் கூறுமை கவனிக்கத் தக்கது.

கோவிந்த ராஜர் முழுக்கருத்தும் ஈண்டு ஆராயத் தக்கது. அவர் அடியில் வருமாறு எழுதுகிறார். "ததா ஹ்யேயதி॥ பாண்ட்யாநாம்=பாண்ட்யராஜாநாம்। யுக்தம்=யோக்யம்। கவாடம்=கவேந நகரம் லக்ஷ்யதே। முக்தாமணிபி: பூஷிதம்=முக்தாமயை: மணிபி: பூஷிதம்; தத்ர தத் உத்பத்தேரிதி பாவ:॥" இதன் பொருள்: பாண்டியாநாம்-பாண்டிய ராஜாக்களுடைய, யுக்தம்-யோக்யம், கவாடம்-இதனால் நகரம் குறிக்கப்படுகிறது, முக்தாமணி விபூஷிதம்-முத்துமயமான மணிகளால் அலங்காரமாகிய, என்றது அது பிறக்குமிடமாதலால் (அங்கே அது மிகுந்துள்ளது) என்பது கருத்து.

இவ்வரும் பதவுரையால், ஸ்ரீகோவிந்தராஜர் "முத்துமயமான மணிகளால் அலங்கார மானதும் பாண்டியர்க்கு யோக்யமானது மான பாண்டியரது கவாடபுரம்" என்பதே பொருள் என்று கருதினாராதல் காண்க. முற்கூறிய தீர்த்தீய திலக வியாக்கியானங்களினும், இவ்வியாக்கியானம் தமிழ்வழக்குகளைத் தழுவி மிகச் சிறந்து நிற்றல் தெளியப்படும்; என்னை? "கபாடபுரம்" என்பது பழங் காலத்தே பாண்டிய ராஜதானியாய் இடைச்சங்கமிருந்து தமிழ்ஆராய்ச்சி செய்துவந்த நகரம் என்பதும், இக்கபாடபுரச் சங்கத்தில் தொல்காப்பியம் செய்யப்பட்டதென்பதும், இச்சங்கமிருந்தார் ஐம்பத்தொன்பதின்மர் என்பதும் பிரசித்த மாதலால் என்க. இதனை, இறையனார் களவியற் பாயிரத்தில் "அவர் (இடைச்சங்கத்தார்) சங்க மிருந்து தமிழ் ஆராய்ந்தது கபாடபுரத் தென்ப" எனவும்; சிலப்பதிகார உரைப் பாயிரத்தில் "இரண்டா மூழியதாகிய கபாடபுரத்தில் இடைச் சங்கத்துத் தொல்காப்பியம் புலப்படுத்திரீஇய நிலந்தரு திருவிற் பாண்டியன் அவைத்து" எனவும்;

"இவ்வகை யரசரிற் கவியரங் கேறினர்
ஐவகை யரசர் ஆயிடைச் சங்கம்
விண்ணகம் பரவும் மேதகு கீர்த்திக்
கண்ணகன் பரப்பிற் கபாட புரமென்ப"

எனவும்* வருவனவற்றால் காண்க. திலக முதலிய வியாக்யானங்

* சிலப்பதிகார உரைப்பாயிரத்தில், மகாமகோபாத்தியாயர் ஸ்ரீ வே. சாமிநாதையரவர்கள் காட்டியிருக்கும் பழைய அகவலொன்றைப் பார்க்க.

களின்படி, கவாட மென்பது பாண்டியரது வாயிற் கதவெனக் கொண்டு, அதற்கேற்ப 'யுக்தம்' என்னும் சொல்லை நகரத் தரனேடு இணைக்கப்பட்ட என்னும் பொருள்படுத்திக் கவாடத் துடன் பொருத்தல் சிறவாமை கண்டு, அது பாண்டியரது நகரத் தையே குறித்ததாகல் வேண்டுமெனச் சுலோகவியல்பை யறிந்து கோவிந்தராஜர் எழுதிய வுரை ஈண்டுப் புகழத் தக்கதாம். கபாட மென்னும் பெயர்கொண்ட பாண்டிய நகர மொன்றிருக்கும் போது, கதவென்னல்வேண்டா என்பது எளிதில் விளங்கத்தக்க தன்றோ. மேலும் நுணுக்கமான இடங்களிலெல்லாம் தேடிவரும் படி வானர வீரர்கள் ஏவப்பட் டிருக்க, ஈண்டு மட்டும், பாண்டி யனது தங்கக் கதவைப் பார்த்து விட்டு வரும்படி கூறப்பட்ட தென்பது வான்மீகியின் கருத் தாகா தென்க. இனி, "முக்தா மணிவிபூஷிதம்" என்னும் அடைக்கு, கோவிந்தராஜர், 'முத்தும் மணியு மிவற்றால் அலங்கரிக்கப்பட்ட எனக் கதவுக் கேற்றிப் பொருள் கொள்ளாது, "முத்துமயமானமணிகளால் அலங்கார மாயுள்ள என்றது-அது பிறக்கு மிடமாதலால் (அந்நகரத்தில் அது மிகுந்துள்ளது) என்றது கருத்து" என்று நகரத்துக்கேற் பக் கூறியதும், அவரது தமிழ் வழக்கினை யறிந்தெழுதும் உரைச் சிறப்பைக் குறிக்கின்றது. என்னை? கபாடபுரம் தாமிரபர்ணி யின் சங்கமத் தயலில் உள்ள தாதலாலும், அந்நதி கடலுடன் கலக்கு மிடத்துப் பிறக்கும் முத்து ஆணித்தரமான தென நூல் கள் கூறலாலும் என்க. இதனை "தலங்காவலன் றஞ்சைவா ணன் முந்நீர் பொருந் தண்பொருந்தத் திலங்கார் வலவடம்"* என்னும் பொய்யாமொழியார் வாக்கானும், ஸ்ரீகாளிதாசரும் "ரகுமகாராஜருக்குஅப்பாண்டியர், தாமிரபர்ணி சமுத்திரத்தில் விழு மிடத்திலிருந்து எடுத்த நன்முத்துக்களை, தாங்கள் அவ்வளவு நாளாகச் சேர்த்து வைத்திருந்த புகழைக் கொடுப்பது போலக் கொடுத்தார்கள்" என இரகுவமிசத்துக் (ஸர்க்-சு; சு-ருo) கூறுதலாலும் அறியலாகும். இதனால் ஆணி முத்துக்களின் வளத்தால் அலங்காரமா யுள்ளது கபாடபுர மென்ப தாயிற்று.

---

* "தஞ்சைவாணனது கடலை யெதிரும் தண்ணிய பொருநை யாற் றின்கண் பிறந்தொளிரும் முத்துக்கள் கோத்த வலிய வடம்" என்பது இதனுரை. (தஞ்சை வாணன் கோவை: பாட்டு ருச.)

இங்ஙனம் "விண்ணகம் பரவு மேதகு கீர்த்திக்-கண்ணகன் பரப்பிற் கபாடபுர" த்தை, தெய்வப்புலமை வான்மீகி முனிவர் சிறப்பித்துக் கூறியிருத்தல் போலவே, அவரால் வேறு தமிழ்நாட்டு முக்கிய பட்டணமும் கூறப்பட்ட துண்டோ எனின்; உண்டு. வானர வீரரிற் சிலரை, சுக்கிரீவன் மேல்நாடுகளில் தேட விடுக்கும் போது அடியிற் கண்ட சுலோகம் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளது.

𑌮𑍁𑌰𑌚𑍀𑌪𑌤𑍍𑌤𑌨𑌂 𑌚𑍈𑌵 𑌰𑌮𑍍𑌯𑌂 𑌚𑍈𑌵 𑌜𑌟𑍀𑌪𑍁𑌰𑌮𑍍 ।
𑌅𑌵𑌨𑍍𑌤𑍀𑌮𑌙𑍍𑌗𑌲𑍋𑌪𑌾𑌂𑌚 𑌤𑌥𑌾 𑌚𑌾𑌲𑌕𑍍𑌷𑌿𑌤𑌂𑌵𑌨𑌮𑍍 ॥

(கிஷ்கிந். காண்டம், ௪௨-ம் அத்யா. ௧௨-ம் சுலோகம்)

இச்சுலோகத்துக் கண்ட நகர முதலியவைகளில், முதலிற் குறித்த முரசீபத்தனம் என்பது அம்மேல் கடற்கரையிலுள்ள முசிறி என்னும் பட்டினமே யாதல் வேண்டும். இது, முற்காலத்தே, சுள்ளி யென்ற பேர்யாறு கடலுடன் கலக்கும் இடத்து விளங்கிய பெருந்துறைமுக மாயும், சேரவரசர்க்கு முக்கிய பட்டணங்களில் ஒன்றாயும் இருந்த தென்றும், மேனாட்டு யவனரது மரக்கலங்கள் மிளகு முதலியன ஏற்றுதற்கு இதுவே அக்காலத்து ஏற்ற பட்டின மான தென்றும், மேற்றேயத்து யாத்திரைக்கார ராகிய பிளினி தாலமி முதலிய யவனாசிரியர் குறிப்புக்களால் விளங்குதலோடு, "சேரலர், சுள்ளியம் பேர்யாற்று வெண்ணுரை கலங்க, யவனர் தந்த வினைமா ணன்கலம், பொன்னொடு வந்து கறியொடு பெயரும், வளங்கெழு முசிறி" என்னும் அகநானூற்று ௧௪௯-ம் பாட்டானும் தெளிவாகின்றது. சேரர்க்குரிய இப்பட்டினத்தை பழங்காலத்துப் பாண்டிய னொருவன் வளைந்து கொண்டு பெரும்போர் புரிந்து, இதன்க ணிருந்த சேரரது படிம மொன்றைக் கவர்ந்து சென்றனன் (அகம்-௧௪௯). இத்தகைய பட்டினம், மிகுந்த பழைமையும் மேல்கடற் பக்கத்ததாயும் இருந்தமையால் இதனையே வான்மீகிமுனிவர் 'முரசீபத்தனம்' என்றன ராதல்வேண்டும். முசிறி என்பதை வான்மீகி முரசீ என்று ஒருபடியாகத் திரித்துவழங்க, பின்னையோ ராகிய வராகமிகிரர் பிரகத் சம்ஹிதையில், இதனை மரீசிபத்தனம் என வழங்கினர். மரிசி-மிளகு; மிளகின் வள மிகுதியைக் கொண்டிருந்தமையால் அப்பட்டினம் அவ்வாறு பெயர் பெற்றிருக்கலாமென்பது வராகமிகிரர் கருத்துப் போலும்.

இனி வான்மீகியார் வாக்கில் சோணுட்டு விசேடங் குறிக்கப்பட்ட துண்டோ எனின், அதுவும் உண்டு. அம்முனிவர் சோணுட்டின் தலை நகரைச் சுட்டாமற் போயினும்; அத் தலைமை நகரமாகிய காவிரிப் பூம்பட்டினத்தின் பக்கத்துள்ள ஒரு தல விசேடத்தைக் கூறுதல் மிகவும் கவனிக்கத்தக்கது. ஸ்ரீராமபிரான் விட்ட பாணத்தால், கரன் பூமியில் மாண்டு விழுந்ததைக் கூறும்போது, வால்மீகியார் அடியில் வருமாறு கூறுகிறுர்.

𑌸 𑌪𑌪𑌾𑌤 𑌖𑌰𑍋 𑌭𑍂𑌮𑍌 𑌦𑌹𑍍𑌯𑌮𑌾𑌨𑌃 𑌶𑌰𑌾𑌗𑍍𑌨𑌿𑌨𑌾 ।
𑌰𑍁𑌦𑍍𑌰𑍇𑌣𑍈𑌵 𑌵𑌿𑌨𑌿𑌰𑍍𑌦𑌗𑍍𑌧𑌃 𑌶𑍍𑌵𑍇𑌤𑌾𑌰𑌣𑍍𑌯𑍇 𑌯𑌥𑌾𑌨𑍍𑌤𑌕𑌃 ॥

இதன் பொருள்:—சுவேதாரண்யத்தில் உருத்திரனுல் தகிக்கப் பட்டு அந்தகன் மாய்ந்தது போல, கரன் ஸ்ரீராமபிரானுடைய சராக்கினியால் தகிக்கப்பட்டுப் பூமியில் விழுந்தான்—என்பது. இவ்விடத்திற்கு உரையிட்ட தீர்த்தர் என்னும் ஆசிரியர் "சுவேதாரணிய மென்பது காவேரிநதி கடலுடன் கலக்கும் இடத் துள்ளது" என்றுர். அஃதாவது இப்போதுள்ள திரு வெண்காடு என்னும் சிவ ஸ்தலமேயாம். காவேரிக்கரையிலுள்ள சுவேதாரண்யத்தில் அந்தகாசுரன் என்பவனைச் சிவபிரான் எரித்தது புராணப் பிரஸித்த மென்பர் திலகர். மற்றும் இவ் வுரைகாரரே, சுவேதாரணியத்தில் சிவபிரான் மார்க்கண்டேயர் உயிர்காத்தற் பொருட்டு யமனைக் கொன்ற சரிதம் நிகழ்ந்ததாக அத்தல மான்மியத் துண்மையால், வால்மீகி அதனைக் குறித்தன ராகக் கொள்ளுதலும் அமையு மென்றனர். யமனை யுதைத்த சரிதம் திருவெண்காட்டுக்கடுத்த திருக்கடவூரில் நிகழ்ந்ததென் பது பிரசித்தமாயினும் அவ்விருதலமும் சுவேதாரணியம் என்ற ஒரே பிரதேசத்தைச் சார்ந்தனவாக முன்பு கருதப்பட்டுச் சரித்திர வொற்றுமை பெற்றன வென்று கொள்ளுதல் குற்ற மாகாது. திருக்கடவூர் போலவே, திருவெண்காட்டிலும் யமனை யுதைத்த கதை நிகழ்ந்த தென்பதற்கு, சம்பந்தமூர்த்திகள் தேவாரத்தில்,

வேலைமலி தண்கானல் வெண்காட்டான் திருவடிக்கீழ்
மாலைமலி வண்சாந்தால் வழிபடுநான் மறையவன்றன்
மேலடர்வெங் காலனுயிர் விண்டபினை நமன்றூதர்
ஆலமிடற் றானடியா ரென்றடர வஞ்சுவரே.

கோள்வித் தனைய கூற்றந் தன்னைக் குறிப்பினால்
மாள்வித் தவனை மகிழ்ந்தங் கேத்து மாணிக்காய்
ஆள்வித் தமர ருலக மளிப்பா னூர்போலும்
வேள்விப் புகையால் வான மிருள்கூர் வெண்காடே

என்ற பாசுரங்களில் அச்சரிதம் திருவெண்காட்டுக் குரியதாகவும் கூறப்படுதலே தக்க சான்றாகிறது. இப்போதுள்ள புராணத்தில் இச்சரித்திரம் காணாமற் போயினும் பழைய புராணமிவ்வாறிருந்ததென்பதே கொள்ளத் தக்கது. இவற்றால், வான்மீகிபகவான், தமிழகத்த சோணாட்டின் முக்கிய விசேடம் ஒன்றைக் குறிப்பிட்டுச் செல்லுதலும் காண்க.

இவற்றால், தமிழ்நாட்டுத் தலைமை நகரங்கள் பலவும் வான்மீகிமுனிவரால் நன்கறியப்பட்டிருந்தன என்பது எளிதில் விளங்கத் தக்கது. நகரங்கள் மட்டுமல்ல; தமிழ்மக்களது வழக்க ஒழுக்கங்கள் சிலவும் அம்முனிவர்க்குத் தெரிந்திருந்தனவென்றே சொல்லலாம். அயோத்தியாகாண்டம், கூ௱-ம் ஸர்க்கத்தில் அம்முனிவர் பரதன் கூற்றாக அடியில் வருமாறு கூறுகிறார்.

[illegible] ।
[illegible] ॥

இதன் பொருள் :—நம் யுத்தவீரர்கள் மேகங்களைப் போன்ற கறுத்த கேடயங்களுடன் தென்னாட்டாரைப்போலத் தலைக்கணியாகப் பூக்களைச் சூடுகின்றனர் என்பது.

தமிழரசர் போர்க்குச் செல்லும் போது அதற்கென்று ஒருவகைப் பூவும தங்குலத்திற்கென்று ஓர் அடையாளப்பூவும் ஆக இருவகைப் பூவுடையரென்பது பழையதமிழ் நூல்களால் அறியப்படும். அன்றியும் நிரைகவர்தல் நிரைமீட்சி முதலாக நிகழும் போர்த் தொழில்களில் ஒவ்வொன்றற்கு ஒவ்வொரு பூச்சூடிச் செல்லுதலும் மரபாம். இப்பூப் பற்றியே வெட்சி கரந்தை உழிஞை வஞ்சி என அப்போர்த்துறைகள் பெயர் பெறுதலுங் காண்க. இவ்வாறே அகப்பொருட் டுறைகளாகிய புணர்தல் பிரிதல் முதலியனவும் குறிஞ்சி பாலை என அவ்வந் நிலத்துக் கேற்ற பூப்பெயரானே வழங்கப்படும். இவற்றால் தென்னாட்டார் பூவணிவதிற் கொண்டுள்ள பெருவிருப்பம்

வெளியாம். இதனையே, மஹருஷி "நம் யுத்தவீரர், தென்னாட்டாரைப் போலத் தலைக்கணியாகப் பூக்களைச் சூடுகின்றனர்" என்று கூறிச் சென்றன ரெனக் கொள்க. தென்னாட்டாரைப் போல வேறெந்நாட்டாரும் பூவை மகிழ்ந்தணிதல் இன்றும் வேறெங்கும் காணக் கிடையா தென்பதும் அறியத்தக்கது.

இன்னும், தென்னாட்டு அரக்கர் செய்கைகளில் அவரிறந்தால் எரிக்கப்படாது புதைக்கப்படுதல் ஒன்றென்று தெரிகிறது; விராதன் என்ற அரக்கன் சாகுந் தருணத்தில் இராமலக்ஷ்மணர்களை நோக்கி "என்னைக் குழியில் அடக்கஞ்செய்துவிட்டு க்ஷேமமாகப் போங்கள்; இறந்துவிட்ட அரக்கரை அடக்கஞ் செய்தலே பழமையான தர்மம்" என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டதாக ஆரணிய காண்டம் 4-ம் சருக்கத்தில் வால்மீகி கூறுகின்றார். இது பழந்தமிழர் கொண்ட முறைமையென்பது, மணிமேகலை, சக்கரவாளக் கோட்டமுரைத்த காதை முதலியவற்றை நோக்குவோர்க்கு விளங்கும். இனி, வாதாபி இல்வலர் கதையை இராமபிரான் தம்பிளவற்கு எடுத்துரைக்குமிடத்தே, இல்வலன் பிராமண வேடந்தரித்துத் தம்மவர்க்குரிய தல்லாத ஸம்ஸ்கிருத பாஷையைப் பேசிக் கொண்டு வந்ததாகக் கூறுவதால், அரக்கர்க்கு வடமொழி அந்நிய பாஷையா யிருந்தது என்பதும் விளங்கும். அன்றியும் ஆரணிய காண்டத்தில் மாரீசன் இராமனது பெருமையை இராவணனுக்கு எடுத்துரைக்கும் போது, "இராமனுக்கு நான் மிகவும் பயந்திருக்கிறபடியால், ரகாரத்தில் தொடங்கும் 'ரத்னம்' 'ரதம்' என்ற பெயர்கள் கூட எனக்குப் பெரும் பயத்தை உண்டாக்குகின்றன" என்றதாக வான்மீகி கூறுகின்றார். இவ்விடத்தில் ரகாரத்துக்குச் சிறப்பாக விதிக்கப்பட்ட 'இப' ச்சாரியையிட்டு "ரேபாதிநீ" எனக் கூறாது, "ரகாராதிநீ" என முனிவர் கூறி யிருத்தலை தென்னாட்டானை மாரீசன் கூற்றாக் கேற்ப வைத்த தமிழ் வழக்கு—என்று கூறுவாரு முண்டு. தமிழர் "ரகாரம்" எனக் 'கார' ச்சாரியை யிட்டே வழங்குவர்.

இனி வான்மீகரைப் பற்றிய மற்றொரு பெருத்த ஐயமும் தமிழ்மக்கட் குண்டு; அஃதாவது அம்முனிவர் பெருமான் தலைச்சங்கத்தவரில் ஒருவராக எண்ணப்பட்ட வான்மீகையார்தா

மோ? என்பது. தலைச்சங்கத்தவரில் வான்மீகனா ரெனப் பெயர் கொண்ட புலவரொருவருள ரென்பது, தொல்காப்பியம், பொருளதிகாரம், புறத்திணையியலில் "அறுவகைப்பட்ட பார்ப்பனப் பக்கமும்" என்ற சூத்திரவுரையில் நச்சினார்க்கினியர் கூறியிருத்தலான் அறிக. இவ்வான்மீகனார் பாட்டொன்று புறநானூற்றில் (௩௫௮) வருவது அடியில் வருமாறு:—

"பரிதி சூழ்ந்தவிப் பயங்கெழு மாநிலம்
ஒருபக லெழுவ ரெய்தி யற்றே;
வையமுந் தவமுந் தூக்கிற் றவத்துக்
கையவி யனைத்து மாற்றா தாகலிற்,
கை விட்டனரே காதலர்; அதனால்,
விட்டோரை விடாஅள் திருவே;
விடாஅ தோரிவள் விடப்பட் டோரே".

இப்பாட்டு, வான்மீகியாரதென்பதற் கேற்பத் தவத்தின் பெருமையே மிக அழகாகச் சிறப்பிக்கின்றது.

இதனை நோக்கும்போது, "தபஸ்வாத்யாயநிரதம்" என்று தம் மிராமாயணத்தைத் தொடங்கிய மகருஷி வானமீகி பகவான் தலைச்சங்கத்தை அறிந்திருந்தவர் தாமோ? என்ற ஐயமுண்டாதல் இயல்பேயாம். இதற்கியைய திரேதாயுகத்தில் வால்மீகி யிருந்ததாகக் கூறும் கன்னபரம்பரையும். இரண்டாமூழியிற் கபாடபுர மிருந்ததாகத் தமிழ்நூல்கள் கூறுவதும் ஒருவாறு ஒற்றுமையும் பெற்றதா யிருக்கிறது. [இரண்டாம் ஊழி-திரேதாயுகம்.] அன்றியும், வால்மீகி முனிவர், தம் ஆதிநிலையில் ஆரியரின் வேறாய வேடர் கூட்டத்துடன் சேர்ந்து கொடுந்தொழில் செய்துவந்து, பின் மகருஷி யானதாகக் கூறப்படுஞ் சரித்திரம், இவர் இத்தேசத்துப் பூர்வகுடிகளுடன் சம்பந்த முடையரா யிருந்ததைக் காட்டுமென்றும், தமிழ்மொழி அப்பூர்வகுடிகள் வழங்கிய பாஷைகளிற் சிறந்ததா யிருந்ததென்றும், வால்மீகியார் வசித்த பிரதேசத்தில் தமிழ் முற்காலத்து வழங்கியிருந்ததென்பதற்கு இப்போதும் அநேக சான்றுகளுண்டென்றும், பிறவுஞ் சில ஏதுக்கள் கூறுதலுமுண்டு. இங்ஙனம் வால்மீகியார் தமிழருடன் சம்பந்த முடையராகக் கூறப்படும் விஷயம் முடிவு கூறத் தக்கதன் றாயினும், தமிழறிஞரது ஆராய்ச்சிக் குரியதே யாம்.

குறிப்பு: வால்மீகி முனிவரது ஆசிரமம் சித்திர கூடம்; இது மத்திய இந்தியாவில் 'பண்டில்கண்ட்' பிரதேசத்தில் உள்ளதென்பார். இவ்விடங்களில் தமிழ்ப்பாஷை முன்னாளில் வழங்கியிருக்கக் கூடுமென்பதற்கேற்ப இம்மத்திய இந்தியாவிலே பெரும்பான்மையான இடங்களிலும் மத்திய மாகாணங்களிலும், அதன் வடபாற் சூடியநாகபுரிப் பிரதேசங்களிலும், அதற்கு வடக்கேயுள்ள 'ராஜ்மஹால்' மலைப் பக்கத்துமுள்ள அரவணரும் (Oraons) மலையரும் (Malar) பாணியரும் (Panians) தமிழ்ச் சாதியின் சரியான அச்சாக இருக்கின்றாரெனப்படுகின்றது. இவரில் மத்தியமாகாணத்தும் சூடிய நாகபுரியிலுமுள்ள பழைய திராவிட ஜனத்தொகை 1901-ம் ஆண்டு ஜன கணிதத்தின்படி, 592,351 என்றும், அம்மக்களது பாஷை "குறுக்கு" (Kurukh) அல்லது "அரவன்" (Oraon) என்றும்; இவர் மொழி, திராவிட பாஷைகளில் ஏனையவற்றினும் தமிழ்க்கன்னடங்களுடன் மிக நெருங்கிய சம்பந்தமுடையதென்றும் தெரியவருகிறது. இனிக் கங்கைக் கரையின்கண்ணுள்ள 'ராஜ்மஹால்' மலைப்பிரதேசங்களில் வசிக்கும் தமிழ்ச் சாதியார் "மலையர் (Malar) எனவும் அவர் பாஷை "மலாடு" (Malto) எனவும் வழங்கப்பெறுமென்றும், இம்மக்களின் றொகை, அக்கணிதப்படி, 60,777 என்றும் இவர் மேற்கூறிய 'அரவன்' களுடன் தொடர்புடைய சாதியாரே யென்றும் சொல்லப்படுகின்றன. (The Imperial Gazetteer of India; Vol I—New Edition-1907—pp. 296; 381—382.)

மு. இராகவையங்கார்,

"செந்தமிழ் பத்திராசியர்."